ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Contents at the End are also inserted in the Margin of the Book over against the places which they refer, which I hope the more Learned pardon, being done for the sake of the ignorant r, and withall to countermine the like practice r Adversaries.

21,2 x 16,3 cm
(1), 100, (7) p

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Contents at the End are also inserted in the Margin of the Book over against the places which they refer, which I hope the more Learned pardon, being done for the sake of the ignorant r, and withall to countermine the like practice r Adversaries.

21,2 x 16,3 cm
(1), 100, (7) p

A

RELIGIOUS CONFERENCE

BETWEEN A

Minister and Parishioner,

Concerning the practice of our Orthodox Church of England, *in* Baptizing Infants *by pouring Water on their faces or Sprinkling them; and in Confirming them afterwards by the Bishop; proving all Three Lawful by good Reasons and the Authority of Holy Scripture.*

With a VINDICATION of the

LAWFULNESS

OF

Godfathers and Godmothers,

And of the Sacred Order of Bishops and their being Spiritual Lords.

Charles Leslie

1 Pet. 3. 15. *Be ready always to give an Answer to every man that asketh you a Reason of the Hope that is in you with meekness and fear.*

1 Cor. 11. 16. *But if any Man seem to be Contentious, we have no such custom, neither the Churches of God.*

LONDON:

Printed for **Charles Brome,** at the *Gun* the *West* end of St. *Paul's*-Church-Yard. MDC XC VIII.

LITERARY DEPARTMENT
UNION
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY
NEW YORK

1698
L63

A

Religious Conference

Between a

MINISTER and PARISHIONER,

Concerning the Practiſe of our Orthodox Church of England, *in Baptizing Infants.*

Pariſh. WELL met Sir; I am heartily glad to ſee you well, I have often wiſh'd for your good Company, and the rather becauſe ſince our laſt Conference I have been aſſaulted with ſome Objections which have a little puzzled me, and I hope you are come in a good Hour to clear them up to me.

Min. I am as glad to ſee you in Health, and that you have your wiſh; and as for your Objections (which I preſume are ſtrong and new, or elſe they cou'd not puzzle you) pray propoſe them in what Method you pleaſe, and I ſhall endeavour to give you a ſatisfactory Anſwer.

P. I leave you to judge of their Strength, I am ſure they are New to me, having not met with the like before; but to detain you no longer with Addreſs;

The Firſt is taken from *Iſa.* 65. 3. where the Prophet gives this ill Character of the *Jews*; a People that provoketh me to Anger continually to my Face, that Sacrificeth in Gardens, and burneth Incenſe upon Altars of Brick; which ought to be made of Gold, Earth, or rough Stone, ſuch being particularly commanded *Exod.* 20. 24, 25. and *chapt.* 40. 5. and the *Jews* acting contrary to thoſe Divine Precepts was the horrid diſobedience

and transgression for which Almighty God do's here reprove them; They for this provoke me to my Face; and from hence an * Opposer of Infant Baptism, infer's that we do as highly provoke God by sprinkling Infants when he has commanded us to dip Believers.

* *Mr.* Keach *in his Book called the* Rector Rectified. *pag.* 181. 184.

M. This is a terrible Objection indeed, if there was any truth in it; but alas! Sir, this Text of *Scripture* is horribly abus'd, by applying it to such a purpose as the Prophet never intended, and it will not bear; for 'tis evident

His first objection from Isa. 65. 3. *answer'd.*

1*st*. That not only Altars of Gold, Earth, and Stone were commanded by God, but also Altars of *Shittim* Wood and Brass; *Exod.* 27. 1, 2. *Chron.* 4. 1. of which the Objection makes no mention, as if no such things had been injoyn'd:

2*ly*. The *Jews* were confined to such Altars; and to the place where they must make them; and where the Priest must Sacrifice and burn Incense upon them; *Deut.* 12. 2, 3, 5, 6, 13 14, and were forbid to Sacrifice or burn Incense in any other place, or in any other manner than Almighty God had appointed them; and he had appointed all the circumstances belonging to his own Worship; and therefore the *Jews* Sacrificing in Gardens and burning Incense there upon any Altars, and even to the true God, was a breach of his Commandment, who had required them to repair to *Jerusalem* for this Religious service.

3*ly*. Tho' their making Altars of Brick might be a breach of the Divine precept, who had appointed other materials for them, yet this was not all; they were guilty of a much greater Sin than this; They had set up Altars against God's Altar; and refused to Worship at the place which he had chosen; and what is more, they worshipped dead Idols instead of the living God; for so Sacrificing in Gardens imports, as is plain from the following Verse; where the same People are said to remain among the Graves, and to lodge in the Monuments (*i e* to consult with the Ghosts of dead Men, or with the Devil in their shapes about present losses, or future events) and to eat Swines flesh and broth of abominable things (*i e* all sorts of unclean meats which by the Law were forbidden; *Levet.* 11. 7, 29.) and appears further from *Isa.* 1.29. They shall be ashamed of the Oaks which ye have desired; and ye shall be confounded for the Gardens that ye have chosen; which *Chap.* 57. 5. he calls enflaming themselves

The Jews provok'd God by sacrificing to Idols in Gardens on private Prohibited Altars; and not to the Lord on the Publick Altar in Jerusalem.

themſelves with Idols under every green Tree; This clearly proves the *Jews* here were guilty of Idolatry, which was a very grievous Sin, tho' the Altar had been of Earth, or Stone, Braſs or Gold, on which it was committed; and ſo *Deodate* expounds the place; the Prophet (ſays he) ſeems to mean the houſe-tops, which were made like Terraces paved with brick, upon which the Idolaters did uſe to burn Incenſe to the Hoſt of Heaven. *Jer.* 19. 13. ſetting up Altars of brick for that purpoſe 2 *K.* 23. 12. *Zeph.* 1. 5. But how do's this prove the unlawfulneſs of ſprinkling Infants, or pouring Water upon their Faces in Baptiſm? Has God injoyn'd every particular relating to this Ordinance, the ſubjects, place, time and exact manner of its Adminiſtration as he did the minuteſt circumſtances appertaining to the Temple ſervice, the Prieſts Garments and Utenſils, the Sacrifices they offer'd and the place where, and the time when, and the Altar on which they were to do it? And has God as expreſly forbid ſprinkling Infants as he did Sacrificing in Gardens and burning Incenſe unto Idols? or has he as expreſly required Dipping grown Believers in Baptiſm as he did Altars of Braſs and Gold, Earth and Stone? Let them prove this and we will never ſprinkle an Infant more; but till they do, I think theſe Altars of Brick which were erected in oppoſition to the Altar of the true God at *Jeruſalem*, are a good Argument to condemn theſe Men's *ſeperate Meetings*, which are ſet up in defiance of the *True Church* of *England*, and ſo the Prophets Character of the *Jews* exactly ſuits them. *A People that provoketh me to Anger continually to my Face; that Sacrificeth in Gardens, and burneth incenſe upon Altars of Brick.*

P. Sir I thank you for opening this Scripture to me, and vindicating it from the falſe gloſs which ſome have put upon it; and I confeſs impos'd ſo much upon me, as to make me think there was ſomething, when I now find there was nothing in it, unleſs it be to condemn their own *ſinful Seperation* in leaving the *True Altar*, and making *Altars* of *Brick*.

M. Pray keep your thanks till we have done, when perhaps I may deſerve them, and go on to your other Objections, for no doubt you have many more behind.

P. The next Objection is raiſed from the Examples of *Nadab* * *Abihu* and *Uzzah*; the two former for offering ſtrange Fire before

*M. K.R. R. pag. 7.

before the Lord which he Commanded them not (tho' in expreſs words he no where forbad them) were cut off by an untimely Death *Levit.* 10. 1. 2. and ſo was *Uzzah* for carrying the Ark upon a Cart, which ought to be carried upon the Prieſts ſhoulders, this provoked God and coſt *Uzzah* his Life.

His 2d. objection from the examples of Nadab and Abihu and Uzzah answer'd.

M. Theſe three Examples are miſrepreſented and miſapplyed. 1*ſt.* They are miſreprefented; for without doubt *Nadab* and *Abihu* had bin forbidden (tho' the Scripture makes no mention of it) to offer any other fire than that burning on the Altar, which was kindled there from Heaven; and their Offering Fire of their own kindling on Earth was an Act of high Diſobedience, and is therefore call'd Strange fire; the word *Strange* when applyed to things of a Religious nature importing as much as *Forbidden*; as Strange Incenſe is forbidden Incenſe, *Exod.* 30. 9. and Strange Gods and Vanities, are ſuch Gods and Vanities as were forbidden, *Jer.* 5. 19. and *chapt.* 8. 19. and this fire from Earth 'twas Lawful for them before to offer, being commanded to offer it, *Levit.* 1. 7. and the Sons of *Aaron* the Prieſt ſhall put fire upon the Altar; but afterwards it ſeems God put it there himſelf, and the Prieſts were then to take their fire from thence and to offer Incenſe upon it, *Levit.* 16. 12. which *Aarons* two Sons *Nadab* and *Abihu* refuſing to do, were both conſumed with Fire from Heaven, and *ſo might read their ſin in the Glaſs of their Puniſhment.*

Theſe Examples miſrepreſented.

The fire which Nadab and Abihu offer'd was forbidden.

P. But what ſay you to *Uzzah*'s Caſe?

M. That likewiſe is miſrepreſented; for the ſin for which he died the Spirit of God declares twice, it was for preſuming to touch the Ark, 2 *Sam.* 6. 6, 7. and when they came to *Nachon*'s threſhing floor, *Uzzah* put forth his hand to the Ark of God, and took hold of it, for the Oxen ſhock it; and the Anger of the Lord was kindled againſt *Uzza*, and God ſmote him there for his Error; and there he dyed by the Ark of the Lord; and 1 *Chron.* 13. 9, 10. and when they came to the Threſhing floor of *Chidon*, *Uzzah* put forth his hand to hold the Ark, for the Oxen ſtumbled; and the Anger of the Lord was kindled againſt *Uzzah*; and he ſmote him, becauſe he put forth his hand to the Ark, and there he dyed before God; how then comes the private ſpirit of a Lay-Preacher to declare that *Uzzah* dyed for carryiug the Ark upon a Cart, which ſhou'd have been carryed on the Prieſts ſhoulders?

He

He ſhou'd have ſaid the *Levites*; for they were firſt commanded to carry the Ark *Numb.* 4. 15. tho' afterwards 'tis true the number of the Prieſts increaſing they carryed it alſo, yet not always, as appears from 1 *Chron.* 15. 2. now tho' God's command was tranſgreſſed in carrying the Ark upon a Cart, yet how was *Uzzah* guilty thereof unleſs he was a Prieſt or Levite? which the Scripture do's not ſay he was; but gives another reaſon of his Death, becauſe he put forth his hand to the Ark; which implies he was neither Prieſt nor Levite; if he had, he might have touch'd the Ark without any offence; and therefore 'tis highly probable he was a Layman only; and his preſuming to touch the Ark or ſome holy thing belonging to It, which none but the Prieſts might do, this coſt *Uzzah* his life; *Numb.* 4. 15. The Sons of *Kohah* ſhall come to bear, but they ſhall not touch any Holy thing, leſt they dye; *Which by the way is a fearful caution to all Laymen, how they uſurp the Prieſts Office, leſt they pay dearly for it in the end, as* Uzzah *did.*

Uzzah ſlain for touching the Ark, or ſome Holy thing belonging to it, which was Death for any Layman.

P. But how are theſe Examples miſapplyed?

M. Your own Reaſon will tell you, theſe Examples being brought to prove, that we may not Baptize Infants, except we are commanded in expreſs words of Scripture to do it; whereas, indeed they prove no ſuch thing; but only that we may not Baptize them, if we are in Scripture forbidden to do it; as *Nadab* and *Abihu* were to offer ſtrange Fire; and *Uzza* to touch any Holy thing belonging to the Ark; let them prove infant Baptiſm as much forbidden as either, or elſe they are impertinent in urging theſe Inſtances which make more againſt than for them.

Theſe examples miſapplyed in Infant Baptiſm, not forbidden as Uzzah was to touch the Ark.

P. I am anſwered as to This, and therefore proceed to a Third Objection, which is inferred from *Deut.* 12. 32. Whatſoever thing I command you obſerve to do; thou ſhalt not add thereto, nor diminiſh from it; whence ſome gather that the Baptiſm of Infants, being an uncommanded rite, the practiſe of it is no leſs than adding to the Word of God.

His 3d objection from Deut. 12. 32. *Anſwered.*

M. This is a heavy charge if it cou'd be made good; but no ſuch thing can be deduced from this Text, for theſe three Reaſons.

1*ſt.* Becauſe it has reſpect only to the Typical, Political, or moral Laws of God; which being of a Prophetick Regal, or Divine nature, the adding to them, or taking from them, implyed

plyed a pretention to Sovereignty, or Divine Inſpiration; and for any Man to do either, was all one, as if he had ſet up for a Prophet or King, that was ſent immediately from God to Inſtruct and Govern the Jewiſh People.

The Feaſt of purim and enlarging the time of the Paſſover were uncommanded things; yet no additions to the word of God.

2*ly*. Becauſe the *Jews* (who underſtood this place of Scripture as well as we) do all agree in appointing and obſerving their Feaſt of Purim, for which they had not a particular command from God *Eſt*. 9. 21, 26, 27. the *Jews* do likewiſe concur in adding to the Feaſt of the Paſſover, in good *Hezekiah*'s Reign Seven days more than God had appointed for the obſervation of it; and yet they are not any where condemned for tranſgreſſing this Moſaical Precept, which yet they muſt tranſgreſs, if they might do nothing in the worſhip of God without a particular Command:

3*ly*. Becauſe the Baptiſm of Infants by good conſequence can be proved from Scripture, and therefore the practice thereof can be no adding to it; if it were, the obſervation of the Lords day, and adminiſtring the Lords Supper to Women were likewiſe adding to the word of God; becauſe there is no particular expreſs commandment in Scripture for either.

P. But there are Examples of the former and that is ſufficient;

M. But where is there any Example for the latter? yet if there were Examples of both; how will they avoid the force of this Text, if it muſt be ſo interpreted as to make the doing every *uncommanded thing* in religious matters, an *adding to the Word of God?* The Text do's not ſay we muſt produce *Examples* for every thing or for any thing we do in the worſhip of God; there being not the leaſt colour for drawing any ſuch conſequence from the Words; and therefore I wonder why theſe men ſhou'd add to their pretended * *Rule, Scripture Examples*? unleſs it be, that being deſtitute of Scripture commands for every thing they do relating to Gods worſhip, they think to juſtify themſelves by having recourſe to Scripture Examples, which yet are not mention'd or ſo much as implyed in the quoted place.

* *A falſe Rule.*

* *That nothing ought to be done in religious matters which has not a particular command or Example of the holy Scriptures to warrant it.*

P. This ſeems to be an adding to the word of God a Rule which is not to be found in it; and to render them guilty of breaking this Commandment of which they falſely accuſe us. But I have a fourth objection to urge. *M*.

M. But pray Sir before you propoſe it, give me leave to urge one thing more againſt the inference they make from *Deut.* 12. 32. and 'tis this; If the want of a particular Precept to Baptiſe Infants be ſufficent to overthrow our Church's practiſe of it; This will likewiſe overthrow their Practice of Water Baptiſm; becauſe there is no other Command but that of *Joh.* 3. 5. which do's expreſly injoyn it; which yet our * Oppoſers in this point will not allow to be meant of Chriſtian Baptiſm; and if they dare not make uſe of this text for fear it ſhould alſo prove the neceſſity of Baptizing Infants, as the only ordinary means of their Salvation; I deſire them to produce an other place of Scripture which Commands us to Baptize with Water, and if they cannot, I ſhall conclude there is no ſuch place to be found in all the Bible; and then they muſt leave off dipping their deluded Proſelites into the Water, having no other Scripture precept to warrant it; and truly this dividing principle upon which many fall from our Church [*that nothing ought to be done in the worſhip of God which has not a particular command in Scripture to warrant it*] carries them farther than they are willing to go, or ſo much as dreamt of in their firſt Separation from it; They firſt of all diſlike ſome of our Ceremonies, as the Surplice, Croſs in Babtiſm *&c.* becauſe not particularly Commanded in Scripture, and ſo turn Presbiterians; after a while they come to diſlike their own new Dicipline as National Churches, Aſſemblies, and Superintendencies *&c.* for the ſame reaſon they diſliked our Ceremonies; becauſe equally deſtitute of a particular Scripture-Precept, and ſo turn Independents; then they again on the ſame grounds come to diſlike Baptizing Infants; becauſe practiced without an expreſs Scripture command, and ſo turn Anabaptiſts; and at laſt they run ſo far as to diſlike Baptizing with Water, becauſe not particularly injoyn'd (as they pretend on the ſame dividing Principle,) and ſo turn Quakers.

* *Mr.* Keach *in his Gold Refin'd.* pag. 128. 129.

This falſe Rule leads to Quakerism.

P. What you ſay is a ſad truth; and I have known ſome men who in the compaſs of a few Years have rung all theſe Changes; and after all thro' the wonderful Providence of God have return'd back into the Communion of our *Orthodox Church of England.*

Mr. Lam's deceived by this rule turn'd Ana. baptist, at last being undeceiv'd, return'd to our Church and Printed two discourses.

M. I earnestly wish and heartily Pray, that all sorts of Dissenters may follow such good Examples; and particularly that of Mr. *Lamb*, who by the several steps I before mention'd fell from our Church into Anabaptism, but at length by the Blessing of God came to be convinced of the Error of his ways, and gave God the Glory, and took shame to Himself by an ingenuous acknowledgment and Retractation; and so like *Noahs* wandring Dove, when he cou'd find no rest for the sole of his feet in the overflowing Floud of Error, he return'd back into the Ark of our Church, the Pillar and ground of Truth; and then wrote and published two * Books on purpose to reduce his straying Brethren.

** Their Titles are a fresh sit against Independency, and a stop to the course of seperation.*

P. This was bravely done indeed; and like St. *Peter*, when he was Converted himself to strengthen his weak Brethren; but what think you of *Act.* 10. 47 can any Man forbid water, that these should not be Baptiz'd? then commanded he them to be Baptiz'd; is not water Baptism commanded here?

** Mr. Norchot in his Baptism, plainly and faithfully discovered.* pag. 22.

M. I know another of their * Authors affirms as much; but 'tis an odd way of arguing, that St. *Peters* demanding, can any Man forbid water? or will any Man deny it? that this should be a commanding it by God? and that St. *Peters* Commanding *Cornelius* his Friends and Family to be Baptiz'd, (suppose with Water) shou'd be Gods commanding all Nations to be Baptiz'd the same way? I confess here is a good consequence, tho' no command for Water-Baptism.

P. But your Opposers will tell you, tho' there shou'd be no Command for Baptizing with water; there are diverse examples of it, and that must expound our Lords precept [*Baptize all Nations*] to be meant of Baptizing them with water, tho he do's not express it;

M. But that is not a necessary Consequence; because there are also examples of some (I mean the Apostles) who were Baptiz'd with Fire; which was promis'd them *Luk.* 3. 16. and came to pass on the day of Pentecost *Act.* 2. 3. There appeared unto them cloven Tongues like as of Fire, and it sate upon each of them *ie* was poured forth on the more eminent part of their Body, their Heads in a visible manner even in cloven Tongues (as Expositors on the place affirm) now why do not these men from this Example make all their deceived Proselites to pass thro'

thro' the Fire, as well as from other examples they make them to paſs thro' the Water?

P. But are you againſt Water-Baptiſm, becauſe you here ſeem to reaſon againſt it?

M. God forbid; no; I intimated before it was commanded in *Joh.* 3. 5. and that is the only Precept wherein it is expreſs'd; tho' I confeſs it may be deduced by good conſequence from this and other places of Scripture; and ſo may Infant Baptiſm; but I am arguing with a ſort of men who require expreſs words of Scripture, for every thing we do in the ſervice of God, or elſe pronounce it unlawful; now there are no expreſs words any where commanding Water Baptiſm excepting that of *Joh.* 3. 5. and therefore according to their own Argument they muſt have recourſe to this Text, or elſe leave off Water Baptiſm; But I forget my ſelf and your fourth Objection; Sir I beg your pardon for this digreſſion.

P. Pray don't complement me with begging pardon, remember you wou'd not ſuffer me to return you thanks.

M. I think there needs ſome Apology when we interrupt any man in his Diſcourſe, but pray proceed to your Objection.

P. 'Tis * this, that Circumciſion cou'd not be a type of Baptiſm; nor Baptiſm come in the room of Circumciſion; becauſe they were both in force together for ſome time; which is proved from *John*'s Baptiſm and that which the Diſciples of our Lord Adminiſtred *Joh.* 4. 1, 2. during which time Circumciſion alſo continued.

* *Mr.* Keach *Reſt. Reſt. pag.* 11. 12.

His 4th. object. from Baptiſm and Circumciſion being in force at the ſame time anſwer'd.

M. I have Four things to offer in Anſwer to it,

1*ſt.* Chriſt's and *John*'s Baptiſm differ'd, ſince St. *Paul* Baptiz'd thoſe again that had receiv'd it, which he wou'd never have done, if it had been the very ſame Baptiſm. *Act.* 19. 3, 4, 5. therefore I think it was only preparatory to Chriſt's.

2*ly.* The Diſciples of our Lord cou'd not Adminiſter Chriſtian Baptiſm, before he gave forth his great Commiſſion to Baptize *Mat.* 28. 19. if that was the firſt giving of it forth, as theſe men contend, and not an enlargment only of it, as I believe it was; and if they will allow the latter, as they muſt or contradict themſelves; then Chriſt muſt have given his Diſciples a Command to Baptize before, which is not recorded in Scripture, (and by parity of Reaſon ſo might Almighty

God give *Nadab* and *Abihu* a Command not to offer Earthly Fire, tho' 'tis not written in the Old no more than This is in the New Teſtament.)

P. But how cou'd Chriſtian Baptiſm and Jewiſh Circumciſion be in force together? do's not this deſtroy the Argument which is drawn from the one to prove the other?

The Jewiſh Paſſover and Lords Supper as much in force at the ſame time.

M. No; no more than it do's the obligation of the Lords Supper, becauſe Adminiſtred at the ſame time that the Paſſover was; and yet I preſume they will grant the Paſſover to be a type of the Lords Supper, and the Lords Supper to come in the room of the Paſſover; For

3*ly*. Notwithſtanding the continuance of Circumciſion a little while after Chriſtian Baptiſm began, it was a dying Ceremony, and ſo was ſuffer'd to expire and to be buryed with ſome kind of Decency; and this do's not hinder the one's being a type of the other, or comming in the ſtead of it; *Thus* Joſhua *ſucceeded* Moſes *in the Government of* Iſrael, *and yet both continued in Authority together a little time before* Moſes's *death*; *and thus a Major elect ſucceeds the old Major*; *and yet the old continues in his office ſome ſhort time before the new enters upon it.* But

The Jewiſh Sabboth and Lords day as much in force at the ſame time.

4*ly*. At this rate of Arguing we may likewiſe prove that the Lord's Day do's not come in the room of the Jewiſh Sabboth; becauſe they were both in force together as much as Baptiſm and Circumciſion; for was not the Jewiſh Sabboth in Force in our Saviours time? *Luk.* 4. 16. as his cuſtom was, he (*i e Jeſus*) went into the Synagogue on the Sabboth Day, and ſtood up for to read, and *Luk.* 6. 16. and it came to paſs on another Sabboth that he entred into the Synagogue and taught; and was it not in force after Chriſts Death and Reſurrection even in the Apoſtles days? *Act* 13. 14. 16. *Paul* and *Barnabas* went into the Synagogue at *Antioch* on the Sabboth day and Preach'd unto the People and *ver.* 42. 44. and when the Jews were gone out of the Synagogue the Gentiles beſought that theſe Words might be preach'd to them the next Sabboth; and the next Sabboth came together almoſt the whole City to hear the word of God; *Act.* 16. 13. and on the Sabboth we went out of the City by a River ſide, where prayer was wont to be made; and we ſat down and ſpake unto the Women that reſorted thither

thither; *Act.* 17. 2. and *Paul* as his manner was went in unto them, and three Sabboth days reaſoned with them out of the Scriptures and *Act.* 18. 4. at *Corinth Paul* reaſoned in the Synagogue every Sabboth and perſwaded the *Jews* and the *Greeks*; And do's it not hence follow, that the *Jewiſh* Sabboth was in force after Chriſt was nail'd to the Croſs, and not nail'd with him unto it? and were not many converted as *Lydia* and her houſhold, and ſeveral others by the Apoſtles preaching to them on the *Jewiſh* Sabboth? and if it be true what * one of that perſwaſion affirms, as his conſtant Tenent; *That an Apoſtolical practice or Goſpel Precedent is of like nature and equal Authority with a Goſpel Precept*; Chriſtians are ſtill bound to keep the *Jewiſh* Sabboth, having Chriſt and his Apoſtles Example for it, which is more than we have for the Obſervation of the Firſt day of the Week, on which we never read that Chriſt aſſembled with the People for religious worſhip; which quite confounds this * mans ſhuffling Anſwer about the obligation of the Lords day, and requires him to give a better or elſe to yield the Cauſe; and therefore I cannot but admire that he ſhou'd have the forehead to affirm, That *we have Examples for the Obſervation of no * other day but the firſt day of the week in the times of the Goſpel*; when all thoſe Examples I have produced (excepting two) were after Chriſts Death and the day of *Pentecoſt*, which certainly muſt be in the Goſpel times; I admire likewiſe at the confidence ſhall I ſay? or folly of this * Author; who bids us *find Infant Church-Memberſhip, and the Seventh day Sabboth-men* (as he calls the Sabbatarians) *to find the old Jewiſh Sabboth in the New Teſtament*; let him find Infant Church-memberſhip to be there aboliſh'd; and the Lords day to be commanded there; or to treat him in his own civil language; *he ſays nothing, but renders himſelf weak and ſtrangly beclouded.*

* *Mr. K. in Reſt. Reſt. p. 35. 36.*

* *Mr. K. R. R. pag. 35. 36.*

* *Idem pag. 36*

* *In his gold refind. pag. 114.*

P. But are you againſt the Obſervation of the Lords day, becauſe you produce ſo many Precedents that Chriſt and his Apoſtles aſſembled to worſhip God on the *Jewiſh* Sabboth, and there is no expreſs Precept in the New Teſtament to countermand it?

M. No, by no means, I am as much for the obſervation of the Lord's day, as I am for admitting Children to Baptiſm,

As good Authority for Infant-Baptiſm as for the Canon of Holy Scripture keeping the Lords day, and giving to Women the Lords Supper.

and Women to the Lords Supper, and as I am for receiving the Books of the Holy Scripture for Canonical; yet I muſt tell you, that I believe all theſe things depend chiefly upon Apoſtolical Tradition, which has been preſerv'd inviolate in all ages of the Church ſince the firſt founding of it; and ſo faithfully tranſmitted from one Chriſtian Generation to another, and will be ſo to the end of the World; and tho' the Apoſtles might receive a command from Chriſt for the Obſervation of the Lords day (as they did to Baptize at firſt) yet neither are recorded; and none of the particulars I have now mention'd can be prov'd by expreſs Scripture, but only by good Conſequences drawn from it.

P. I am glad you have clear'd up this to me; it ſhall make me cautious how I deny Infant Baptiſm, leaſt I ſhou'd alſo come to queſtion the Canon of Holy Scripture, and the obſervation of the Lords day.

M. Indeed I cou'd tell you of ſome formerly that from Anabaptiſm tumbled into * Atheiſm, and openly own'd it and boaſted of it; but I forbear naming them becauſe I ſuppoſe they are dead; and ſhall paſs no further judgment on them that are already judged of the Lord.

* Grangren. 1ſt. part. pag. 22d. 2d. part. p. 134.

P. You are more favourable to their dead than they are to our Living, whom one of their famous writers and Teachers treats in ſuch ſcurrilous language as this * *Mourn O* England *and lament, ſad is thy caſe! if theſe men ſpeak right or truly, what a multitude in thee have been made to enter into this Covenant who never perform'd it? O perjured Nation! perjured people! and perjured Paſtors!*

* Mr. Reach in Reflor Reflifyed pag. 151.

His ill Character of the Clergy and People of England.

M. But if *Perjury* is become a *National Sin* (as this Author affirms) how comes he and his party to eſcape the guilt of it? Have not ſome of them broken their Baptiſmal Vow and Covenant as well as all our *Engliſh World* beſides?

P. But he goes on; For ſo are all thy debauched, drunken Swearing and unclean Teachers——

M. Pray Sir hold; I deſire to hear no more ſuch *Billingsgate* diſcourſe; theſe are baſe Reflections and falſe Calumnies caſt upon a whole body of men, of whom in Charity as well as juſtice he is bound to have a better opinion; but if he knows any to deſerve the Scandalous Epithetes he beſtows upon them; let

let him discover and convict them in order to their punishment; and let not all the rest that are Innocent, suffer for their sakes; but enough and too much of such personal Reflections which are nothing to the Merits of the cause; and stick to your Objections if you have any more to make.

P. I shall Sir; but you must excuse me, if now and then (as there is occasion) I let you and the World know what opinion these men have of us.

M. They can't have a worse than to unchurch all Christendom; and to hold there is no true Church of Christ but their own in the whole world; and * the Author you last quoted slyly insinuates as much by saying, * *you take that for granted, which you prove not*, viz. *that all the Churches who hold Infant-Baptism are true Churches of Christ*; *Sir I must tell you, we have no such Power of Faith as to believe that*; And 'tis remarkable that he blames his Antagonist here for *leaving out the Church of Rome*, and mentioning only *Protestant Churches*; as the Church of England, the French, Dutch Bohemian and Helvetian Churches; and therefore his meaning must be, that he do's not, he cannot believe all these *Protestant Churches* to be the *true Churches* of Christ; I wish when he writes again he would tell us whether any of those, and which of them be true Churches of Christ? and in which Catalogue the Church of England must be reckoned? since I find one of their party * declares roundly, *that to Baptize Infants is to deny that Christ is come in the Flesh*; and all of them in effect own as much in Rebaptizing all Proselites that fall from other Churches to theirs.

* *Mr.* K. *Rect. Rect.* pag. 139.
* His horrible uncharitableness towards all Protestants.
* *Cocks* Declaration &c. pag. 13.

P. This is uncharitable indeed; but my Author has more Charity, if you will believe him; * He *will not say this error of ours about Infant Baptism is a Soul-damning Error, God forbid.*

* *Mr.* K. *Rect. Rect.* pag. 140.

M. This is meer Collusion and deceit (like *Pontius Pilate's* washing his hands, when he condemnned Christ) what? do's this Error make us a mock Church, and mock Christians, and on that account they Rebaptize those that go from us to them, and they cannot for this (if we had no other Error) believe us to be a True Church (if they will speak out) as some of them have done; and yet this is no Soul-damning Error? what? can He call this a * sinful act, and a Profanation of the ordinace of Baptism? which certainly (if not repented of) must be

* *Idem.* pag. 150.

be a Soul-damning Act, and yet say this is no Soul-damning Error? let him for shame leave such fulsome Complements or else no one hereafter will give credit to what he says; especially since here he takes Gods name in vain to justify a manifest untruth and contradiction; God forgive him and all his Party their Prodigious uncharitableness; and make them more Charitable for the time to come; but pray Sir go on with your Objection, I am sure 'tis time for it.

P. There is no time lost in this digression; but they object

5*ly*. That * what is not Commanded is Forbidden, especially in Instituted worship; or else whither shall we run? were it not thus; how cou'd we deny or oppose the Papists Seven Sacraments? or how cou'd we condemn Salt, Oyl, and Spittle to be used in Baptism which they use in it? seeing these are not forbid; nay 'tis as Lawfull to * Baptize Bells as Infants; because Christ has no where forbidden the one more than the other; and this Objection is often repeated as if their were a great deal in it.

* *Idem* pag. 7. 66. 67. 126.

* *Idem. in Gold Refin'd.* pag. 148.

M. To this I have in part answer'd before, and have these things to add;

The 5th Object. what is not Commanded is forbidden; answered no command for the Lord's day, for womens receiving the Passover, or the Lord's Supper.

1*st*. Where is it commanded that the Jewish Women should receive the Passover? or Christian Women the Lord's Supper? where is it commanded that we should keep the Lord's day? or stated times of religious worship? I believe they can produce no such Precept; therefore by their own Argument these things are forbidden, especially since they belong to instituted worship; or else whether shall we run?

2*ly*. In the Circumstantial parts of Divine worship, such as standing, sitting or kneeling at the Lords table; dipping or sprinkling in Baptism *&c*. 'Tis not necessary that we shou'd have a particular Command for every thing we do to make it Lawful for us; 'tis enough in such cases that we be not forbidden, and then it cannot be unlawful; and if this rule be limitted to such cases only, it is true and safe, and we cannot err in following it; but in the substantial parts of Divine worship as the Lord's Supper and Baptism it self, these must have a Divine Institution, an expres command, or else 'tis presumption and will worship to perform them; and therefore we reject Five of the Romanists Seven Sacraments; because our Lord never Instituted and appointed them as Sacraments; and we stick only to

Two

Two as generally neceſſary to Salvation, *viz.* Baptiſm and the Supper of our Lord; now is it not a groſs miſtake (to ſay no worſe of it) to ſtretch this Rule, (as this Author do's) to neceſſary things, which is to be confined to things indifferent? and to the truth of this Rule, which relates only to the Circumſtantial parts of Divine worſhip, they themſelves muſt ſubſcribe, or elſe condemn ſeveral of their own Ceremonies, as their receiving the holy Sacrament ſtanding or ſitting; their praying and preaching in a Pulpit adorn'd with a pluſh Cuſhion and on ſuch ſtated and appointed hours of the Lords day, and other days of the week, for all which 'twill be hard for them to produce any expreſs Command of Chriſt or his Apoſtles.

The Rule that whatſoever is not forbidden is lawful, to be reſtrain'd to Indifferent things.

3*ly.* As to many of the Romiſh Ceremonies our Church did not reject them becauſe they were in themſelves ſinful; but becauſe burdenſom, and apt to take off our minds from the Subſtance of Religion, and to make it reſt in meer Shaddows; and therefore at the Reformation we retain'd ſuch only as were few and decent and apt to raiſe and aſſiſt our Devotion; and what an Argument is this? Becauſe a Church may abuſe its Authority (as that of *Rome* do's) in impoſing ſuch a vaſt number of indifferent things, as to make the ſervice of Almighty God (which is clogg'd with them) a *Jewiſh* yoke, therefore we may not uſe any Ceremonies at all in God's worſhip, tho' never ſo few and ſignificant and ſuch as are fairly conſiſtent with our Chriſtian liberty? * *'Tis poſſible a Parliament may inact ſuch Laws as are not only burthenſom and greivous, but alſo deſtructive to the Peoples Liberties and their very lives*; and ſhall we for fear of that refuſe to obey thoſe good and wholeſome Laws that are already made, altho' they are not miſchievous or Sanguinary, but for our general good and welfare? the caſe is Paralel, and may eaſily be applyed.

Many of the Romiſh Ceremonies rejected by our Church, not becauſe ſinful but becauſe burdenſom and an infringment of our Chriſtian and national Liberty.

4*ly.* And I have done with this point; this Objector takes it for granted that all the Ceremonies of the Church of *Rome* are unlawful; but do's not prove it, which he ought to have done if he wou'd convince them of Sin in the practice of them; and 'twas not on that account that we refus'd to receive many of them, (as I intimated before) but becauſe of their multitude and burthen; and likewiſe becauſe every National Church has power to appoint what Ceremonies they think meet, and

to

to alter them as they judge moſt expedient; as may be ſeen more at large in the Preface to the Common prayer Book.

P. I believe what you ſay to be true; but muſt tell you that if ſome of theſe men ſhou'd hear your diſcourſe, they wou'd ſay you were Popiſhly affected, and did plead for Popiſh Ceremonies.

M. I do not value what uncharitable People think or ſpeak, when I give them no juſt grounds for it; *I know 'tis much eaſyer to call ſome Perſons Papiſts, and ſome things Popiſh, ſenſleſs, and ſinful, than it is to prove them ſo*; but let them have a care how they paſs ſuch raſh cenſures, and upbraid us with Seven Sacraments, who have themſelves formerly practiz'd one of them that is truly popiſh; I mean the *Anointing their ſick members with oyl*, which they cannot charge on any Miniſters of our Church) and I never heard yet that by any publick act they have condemn'd it; but I am loath to expoſe them.

The Anabaptiſts have anointed their Sick with Oyl, which is one of the Popiſh ſeven Sacraments.

P. Pray Sir oblige me with a particular account of it; what tho' the Parties be Dead (which I preſume is the Reaſon you wou'd bury it in ſilence) yet 'tis not fit that ſuch errors ſhou'd live, as they might, if they paſs uncenſured, and therefore you ought to lay them open that others may avoid them.

M. Becauſe you are ſo Importunate, I'le tell you the Story word for word as 'tis related in Print, being unwilling to miſrepreſent or aggravate the matter. *I had it* (ſays my * Author) *from Eye and Ear witneſſes who were preſent at* Kiffen *and* Patience's *Viſitation of one of their Members whoſe name is* Palmer *living in* Smithfield, *who laid hands upon her, and Anointed her with Oyl; the Woman recovering came unto their Conventicle-houſe, and there before many People ſaid that Brother* Kiffen *and* Patience *Anointing her with Oyl, ſhe ſuddenly recover'd.*

* Gangrena 1ſt part. pag. 6.

P. I wonder what they would ſay to this? if they do not publickly diſown and condem this practiſe, let them no more object the Papiſt's Seven Sacraments to us; but what do you anſwer to the latter part of my Objection? that 'tis as Lawful to Baptize Bells as Infants, becauſe Chriſt has no where forbid the one more than the other; I believe you had forgot it.

M. It had bin no great matter if I had, being not worth the anſwering; but your Author that ſeems Angry with us for charging them to have ſaid, we may as warrantably

Bap-

Baptize a Beaſt as a Child, and calls it a * bad and unſeemly Compariſon, I wonder he ſhou'd make uſe of as bad an unſeemly Compariſon himſelf in ſaying we may as warrantably Baptize Bells as Infants; For *M. K. Reſt. R. pag. 141.*

1*ſt.* They themſelves Adminiſter the Lord's Supper to Women without any expreſs Precept or Example to that purpoſe; and may I not then on the ſame ground demand likewiſe of them, why they do not give the Lord's Supper to Bells as well as to Women? becauſe that Sacrament is no more forbidden to be given to the one than the other; *To reſemble Infant Baptiſm to the Baptiſm of Bells a bad and unſeemly Compariſon*

2*ly.* Have Bells reaſonable Souls that are alſo capable of the Spirit of God, as Infants have? did our Lord *Jeſus* bleſs Bells? and pray for them, as he did for Infants? *Luk.* 18. 15. They themſelves allow ſome Infants to belong to the Election of Grace, and that if we knew who they were, we might Lawfully Baptize them; but *are there any ſuch Bells in the World?* for ſhame let them leave off ſuch bad and unſeemly Compariſons, or elſe (to treat him in the ſame high and * threatning ſtrain that he do's the *Athenian* Society) *we ſhall further expoſe him and his Party than we have yet done*; *Idem pag. 26.*

P. But is not the Baptizing of Infants a ſubſtantial part of Religious Worſhip? and if it be; there muſt be a Command for it, or elſe by your own Rule, it is forbidden.

M. It is as Subſtantial a part, as the Lord's Day, and Women's receiving the Lord's Supper; and can be proved by as good Scripture and Reaſon; as I ſhall (God willing) ſhew by and by; but I wou'd hear all your Objections before I produce my Reaſons and Scripture proofs for it.

P. They * object Sixthly that *Abraham*'s Seed will bear but one of theſe Four Sences; either Firſt it muſt reſpect *Jeſus* Chriſt; 2*d.* all the Elect; 3*d.* the natural Seed that was to receive the Inheritance, as *Iſaac*; and 4*th.* the natural Seed that was not to recieve it, as *Iſhmael* and the Sons of *Keturah*; but how can the Infant Seed of Believers (as ſuch) be ſaid to be *Abraham*'s Seed in any of theſe Four Reſpects? add if you can a Fifth. *Idem pag. 44.* *The 6th. Obj. from Abraham's fourfold Seed anſwered.*

M. This is a bold challenge indeed; and therefore I will try what may be done to ſhame (if poſſible) and foil him that made it; What thinks he of the *Proſelite Strangers* of other Nations? were not they alſo *Abraham*'s Seed? elſe how cou'd they have

bin receiv'd together with their Children into Church membership? as 'tis apparent they were; the proſelited Parents as ſoon as they became followers of *Abraham*'s Faith, bringing their Children into Covenant the ſame way, and ſo they both became alike viſible Members of the Jewiſh Church, as is clear from *Exod.* 12. 49. one Law ſhall be to him that is home born, and to the Stranger that ſojourneth among you; now under which of his *Four ſorts of Seed* will he rank theſe *Proſelite ſtrangers* and their Children? he dares not ſay they were Chriſt; he cannot ſay they were all of them Elect; or that any of them were *Abraham*'s natural Seed, either ſuch as receiv'd or did not receive the Inheritance; what then? there is, there muſt be a Fifth ſort of Seed; and ſo they cou'd be no other than *Abraham*'s *imputative Seed*; and ſuch are all Believers Children, they are *Abraham*'s imputative Seed; *i e* as *Abraham*'s Faith (who was a believing Jew) was imputed to him for Righteouſneſs, and ſo far to his Children too, as to be a means to initiate them into Covenant with God by Circumciſion; ſo the Faith of believing Gentiles ſhall not only be imputed to them for Righteouſneſs, but ſo far alſo to their Children as to be a means to initiate them into Covenant by Baptiſm; and this ſeems evident to me from *Rom.* 4. 16. therefore it is of Faith, that it might be by Grace, to the end the Promiſe might be ſure to all the Seed, not to that only which is of the Law *i e* to *Abraham*'s natural Children; but to that alſo *i e* that Seed which is of the Faith of *Abraham i e* to the Children of believing Gentiles, who in God's eſteem and the Eye of the promiſe are *Abraham*'s imputative Seed, who on this account is the Father of us all.

The proſelite ſtrangers Abraham's *imputative Seed.*

The exception to this from Rom. 4. 16. *removed the promiſe ſure to* to Abrahams *imputative ſeed on Gods part.*

P. But againſt this they argue; Then all the Children of believing Parents muſt be ſaved; becauſe the Promiſe is ſure to all the Seed; but ſome of them may and 'tis probable do periſh forever, and therefore they cannot be the Seed to whom the Promiſe is ſure.

M. This looks like a ſpecious Argument, but really Sir, there is nothing in it; for *Firſt* The promiſe is here ſaid to be ſure to *Abraham*'s Seed under the Law, as well as to his Seed under the Goſpel; now this Objector will not allow all *Abraham*'s natural Seed to be ſaved; he excepts *Iſhmael* and *Eſau* out of that number; and a great many more as I ſhall ſhew anon; and how

then.

then was the promiſe ſure to all the Seed when that of the Law for the moſt part fail'd of it? and if notwithſtanding this the ſureneſs of the promiſe cou'd not be impeach'd; no more can it be, tho' ſome of the Seed under the Goſpel fall ſhort of it; neither

The impious Doctrine of Mr. K. that the Goſpel covenant is free and abſolute without works, or any conditions or foreſeen Acts of righteouſneſs, or any thing to be done by the creature.

2*ly*. Do's this make the promiſe void and of none effect, which is ſtill ſure on God's part; and if any believers Children ſhou'd (when they are grown up and die) miſs of it; the fault is theirs in not laying hold on it; ſo that the promiſe is ſure and certain in it ſelf, and wou'd be ſo to all the Seed, if they perform'd the Conditions on which it was made; which thro' the Grace of God (that is never wanting) they may be able to perform; For the promiſe of Eternal Life is not abſolute but conditional, as is plain from the whole current of Scripture, particularly *Mat*. 19. 17. If thou wilt enter into Life keep the Commandments.

P. But as I remember the Author we have been diſcourſing of teaches the contrary Doctrine; he ſays the *Promiſe of the Goſpel or Goſpel Covenant was the ſame in all Ages in reſpect of the things promiſed, with the nature and quality thereof,* * *which is a free and abſolute Covenant without works or any Conditions, or foreſeen acts of Righteouſneſs, or any thing to be done by the Creature.*

* Mr. K. R. R. pag. 55.

M. Bravely ſpoken! and like a *true Libertine and Antinomian*! But what Scripture proof do's he bring for this Abſolute unconditional Covenant?

Rom. 4, 5. *rigtly interpreted proves the Goſpel covenant to be conditional, and and not abſolute.*

P. 'Tis *Rom*. 4. 5. but to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that juſtifieth the ungodly, his Faith is counted for Righteouſneſs.

M. This very Text quite overthrows his Abſolute unconditional Covenant; what *no condition* in this Covenant of Salvation, and yet *Faith* required in order to it? What *nothing* to be done by the Creature, and yet he muſt *believe* on him that juſtifieth the ungodly? not whilſt they continue in their ungodlineſs, (for then all fleſh wou'd be ſaved) but he juſtifyeth them when they repent and forſake their ungodlineſs; and ſuch a Faith worketh by Hope and Love, by Charity and univerſal Obedience to all the Laws of God, or elſe 'tis Hypocritical and dead; and tho' it be ſaid in the beginning of the Verſe, To him that *worketh not*, the meaning is, that do's not hope to be ſaved

by the Works of the Law, which consisted in unsinning Obedience, which we cannot perform. Yet we must be saved by such a Faith as produceth all manner of good Works under the Gospel, which are a certain indication of the life and sincerity thereof *Ja.* 2. 17, 22. For God's sake (whose holy Name and Covenant is Blasphem'd thereby) desire some Friend to tell this man to read this passage again, [That *the promise of the Gospel is a free and Absolute Covenant without works or any conditions, or foreseen acts of Righteousness, or any thing to be done by the Creature*] and upon a review it is hoped he may openly retract it as *false and impious Doctrine* ; or else that he will bring better Scripture proofs (if he is able to confirm it ; But have you any more Objections ?

Idem. R. R. *pag.* 107

P. Yes, four or five more and I have done ; They object Seventhly That fœderal Holiness cannot qualify the Jews Children for Baptism ; and this * one of them proves from *Mat.* 3. 9. where some of the branches of this root (he means *Abraham*) came to *John Baptist* to be Baptized ; and he refused (as he says) to admit them with these words ; think not to say within your selves we have *Abraham* to our Father ; for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up Children unto *Abraham* ; *ver.* 10. and now also the Ax is laid to the root of the Trees ; from hence (he there adds) it plainly appears that that external relative Covenant holiness which qualifyed Persons under the Old Testament for Circumcision and Jewish Church membership, will not qualify Old nor Young under the New Testament for Baptism and Gospel Church membership.

His seventh Objection from Mat. 3. 9. *answer'd.*

M. This is an abominable abuse of the Sacred Text, from which no such thing can be inferr'd, but the quite contrary ; for is it not clear from St. *Matthew* and the rest of the Evangelists that *John* Baptiz'd all these branches that came to him and did not refuse any whether Old or Young that wou'd be Baptiz'd ? *Mat.* 3. 5. then went out to him *Jerusalem* and all *Judea*, and all the region round about *Jordan*, and were Baptized of him in *Jordan* confessing their Sins ; and when he saw the Pharisees come to his Baptism he do's not reject them by saying ; think not to say within your selves, we have *Abraham* to our Father ; no ; he only thereby gives them good Coun-

cil.

cil not to rely too much upon their Church priviledges that they were the Seed of *Abraham*; for God cou'd of the Stony-hearted Gentiles, or of the very Stones in the Street raiſe up Children to *Abraham*, ſuch as being followers of *Abraham*'s Faith ſhou'd receive for themſelves and Children the ſame Church-priviledges that *Abraham* had for himſelf and his; and then *John* wou'd have admitted theſe Phariſees on profeſſion of their Repentance to Baptiſm, in theſe words *ver.* 7. 11. who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? I indeed Baptize you with water unto repentance.

P. But St. *Luke*'s ſays that the Phariſees and Lawyers were not Baptiz'd of *John chap.* 7. 30. might he not then reject them?

All the Jews that came to John for Baptiſm received it, if they pleas'd none rejected by him for want of ſederal Holineſs.

M. No ſuch matter; 'Twas their own fault that they were not Baptiz'd of him. for 'tis there ſaid they rejected the Council of God againſt themſelves, which was that Council which *John* gave them to bring forth Fruits, meet for Repentance; and that was the reaſon they were not Baptiz'd of him; *John* did not exclude the Phariſees and Lawyers from his Baptiſm, but they ſcorn'd to receive it, and ſo excluded themſelves from it. and yet at the ſame time all the people (*i e* the Vulgar ſort of Jews) and the Publicans (who were reckoned the moſt Scandalous perſons among them) receiv'd *Johns* Baptiſm *Luk.* 7. 29. all the People that hear'd him, and the Publicans juſtified God being Baptized with the Baptiſm of *John*. in another place *chapt.* 3. 10, 12, 14, 16. the ſame Evangeliſt ſays; the People, Publicans, and Soldiers were Baptiz'd of *John*; *John* anſwered and ſaid unto them all, I indeed Baptize you with Water—— and St. *Mark* ſays *chapt.* 1. 5. there went out unto him all the Land of *Judea* and they of *Jeruſalem*, and were Baptized of him; is not the caſe plain then that none were rejected by *John*; one wou'd think indeed by this Objection that all the Jews had bin rejected; but by the texts I have quoted it appears that none of them were rejected by him; neither the People, neither the Publicanes, nor Souldiers; and the Phariſees and Lawyers might have bin Baptiz'd, if they wou'd; and amidſt ſuch a vaſt multitude and concourſe of People, 'tis ſtrange there ſhould be no little Children among them; and if there were; 'tis highly probable they were Baptiz'd as well as their Parents, altho they cou'd not confeſs their Sins,,

Sins, of which there was no need if they never committed any; ſo that this place of St. *Matthew* which is produced againſt ſederal Holineſs, and on that account againſt Infant Baptiſm, do's indeed rather confirm it; becauſe for the ſake of it *John* admitted ſuch multitudes of the Jews (which we can hardly ſuppoſe without Children) unto his Baptiſm; To conclude this point; I muſt here reprimand the Objector in his own words; *let him Bluſh for the ſake of his pretious Soul, and take more care for the time to come to what he writes and prints.*

P. If he has any Conſcience or Modeſty left, I believe he will be more cautious for the future; how he ventures to corrupt the Word of God and miſapply it; but what ſay you to his Eighth Objection? 'Tis this; If Children are in Covenant with God as they are the natural Seed of beleivers, then Baptiſme do's not bring them into it; and their ſtate is good whether Baptiz'd or no? but if Baptiſm brings them into the Covenant of Grace, then they have not a right thereto, becauſe they are already in it.

The 8th. Objection from Baptiſm being needleſs for Children if already in Covenant. anſwer'd

M. I have Two things to return in Anſwer to this.

1*ſt.* If their be any force in this Objection, it concludes as ſtrongly againſt their Baptizing grown believers; becauſe they are already in Covenant with God, and therefore Baptiſm cannot bring them into it; by Baptizing ſuch you cannot put them into a better State; nor into a worſe by not Baptizing them, and therefore you had as good let them alone; but if you ſay Baptiſm brings grown Believers into Covenant with God, then they have not a right thereto on the account of their being already in it; thus this mighty Argument is turn'd upon them, and by a little Improvement may be brought to prove that we muſt lay aſide Water Baptiſm, and reduce all to the Light within (as the Quaker do's)

This Objection as good againſt Baptizing grown beleivers they being alſo in Covenant before as much as beliewers Children.

P. But they ſay there is a command for Baptizing grown Believers, and on that account they do Baptize them, tho' they be in Covenant before.

M. But this do's not ſolve the difficulty; becauſe theſe men make Baptiſm an Ordinance that initiates into the Church of Chriſt, (as really it do's) and then we cannot be of the Church of Chriſt before we are initiated by this Sacrament into it; and conſequently we cannot be in Covenant before we are Baptiz'd;

tiz'd; but if Baptiſm do's not initiate into the Church of Chriſt and ſeal the Covenant to us, of what uſe is the Ordinance at all? and why was it commanded? ſurely it may be let alone, if it ſeal nothing to us, and we may be Saved without it, as ſome of that party have affirm'd.

P. Truly at this rate of arguing Baptiſm ſignifies no great matter, but I deſire you wou'd prove what you ſay that they may not pretend you accuſe them falſely.

M. They * ſay *Baptiſm is no ſeal of the Covenant of Grace; that it forms no Child of God; but is only an outward Signe, and by their own confeſſion a fallible one too, ſince the inward Grace may be wanting*; They * ſay further; *we do not lay ſuch ſtreſs upon it* (*i e* the Baptiſm of grown believers) *as ſome do upon infant Baptiſm; we do not ſay men cannot be ſaved unleſs they are Baptiz'd; provided they do not Sin againſt their light and clear convictions of their own Conſciences.*

* *Mr.* K. *R. R. pag.* 2 81. 83. 192.

* *And in his Gold refin'd pag.* 161.

Mr. Keach *ſays men may be Saved without Baptiſm.*

P. Strange Doctrine this? God deliver me from ſuch blind Guides; at this rate men may break any other of Gods Commandments; they may Lie, Steal, and Swear falſly, and commit any other Wickedneſs, provided they do not act againſt the clear Convictions of their own Conſciences, and be Saved notwithſtanding. I ſtand Amazed at ſuch ſtrange Divinity as this.

M. And well you may; but let us leave him to Meditate upon that paſſage in St. *Matthew chapt.* 5. 19. whoſoever therefore ſhall break one of the leaſt Commandments, and ſhall teach men ſo; he ſhall be called the leaſt in the Kingdom of Heaven, *i e* ſhall have no place there, but be ſhut out from it; and I Proceed to anſwer.

2*ly.* When we ſay believers Children are in Covenant with God, we mean no more, than that they have a right to the Covenant of Grace; but this right muſt be claim'd and Aſſerted (which in an ordinary way can only be done by their Baptiſm) before they are actually in the Covenant, and entituled to all the Bleſſed priviledges thereof; here that diſtinction of *Right to a thing* and *Right in a thing* takes place; as a Purchaſer has right to an Eſtate, but 'tis *Livery* and *Seiſne* puts him into Poſſeſſion of it; and by the Charter of a Town a Freeman's Son may have right to his Freedom as ſoon as he is

Believers Children have a right to the Covenant before; Baptiſm gives a right in it.

is born, but the Father or ſome Friend muſt demand it for the Son, and cauſe his Name to be enrol'd before he can be actually Free of the Place; in like manner Believers Children have a right to the Covenant of Grace, but their beleiving Parents or Charitable Friends muſt firſt bring them to Baptiſm, and enrol their Names in Chriſt's regiſter, before they can be Initiated into it, or intereſted in it; and therefore their ſtate is not good and ſafe whether Baptiz'd or no? They muſt be Baptiz'd before they are actually in Covenant, or can lay any Lawful claim to the great Bleſſings thereof; and the true reaſon why they are admitted to Baptiſm is not, becauſe they were actually in Covenant before, but becauſe by Vertue of the Promiſe *Act.* 2. 39. they have an outward and Imputative right and relation to the Covenant, and by their being Baptiz'd they have an inward and real right in it; Baptiſm being as it were the Livery and Seiſne that puts them into the Poſſeſſion of the Goſpel-Covenant, and makes their former claim effectual and good.

Mr. K. *R. R. pag.* 47.

P. But againſt this they argue; if this be ſo, that Baptiſm brings Children into the Covenant of Grace, and makes it ſure to them; it will follow, that 'tis in the Power of men to bring their Children into the Covenant of Grace, or to keep them out of it; and that is in effect to ſay Parents have power to ſave or deſtroy their Children; which they look upon as a great abſurdity.

Children that dye un-baptiz'd in Infancy may be Saved; tho' their Parents for their wilful neglect to Baptize them may be Damned.

M. Sir altho' we grant it lies in the Parents Power to bring their Children by Baptiſm into the Covenant of Grace; and (if they then die before they commit actual Sin) to be the inſtrumental cauſe of their Salvation; tho' we grant this (I ſay) yet we deny, if the Parents neglect the Childrens Baptiſm, and their Children die without it, that it alſo follows that the Parents muſt neceſſarily be the Inſtrumental cauſe of their Childrens Damnation; indeed they run a dreadful hazard, but notwithſtanding the fault being wholly the Parents and not the Childs, he may be Saved thro' Gods extraordinary Mercy, when the other without an Extraordinary Repentance may be Damn'd; as *Moſes* was almoſt ſlain by a deſtroying Angel (ſay ſome) by a deſtroying diſeaſe (ſay others) for neglecting to Circumciſe his Child in the Wilderneſs, where yet he might have

have ſome plea for it, being in a travelling Condition; but the Child who was not, cou'd not be Guilty, happily eſcap'd.

P. But do you hold that Children dying in infancy may be ſaved without Baptiſm? this is like that dangerous Error we juſt now Condemn'd in our Antagoniſt.

M. No, 'tis nothing like it; for I do not ſay they certainly are, but poſſibly may be Saved; and 'tis by an Extraordinary and uncovenanted Mercy, having no Authority from Scripture to warrant it.

P. But what think you of that Place in St. *Matthew* Chap: 19. 14. of Such is the Kingdom of Heaven? Do's not this prove that they are Saved tho' they ſhould dye without Baptiſm?

M. No, it do's not; but only that they have a Title to the Kingdom of Heaven, which yet may be Forfeited, if the one thing Neceſſary is neglected, which Chriſt has ordain'd as the only ordinary means of opening a Paſſage into it, and that is Chriſtian Baptiſm. *Joh.* 3. 5. except one be Born of Water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God; whence it appears that Baptiſm is the door that lets Children into the Church of God, and that likewiſe opens the other Door for them into the Kingdom of Heaven: pray hear what a Learned Prelate of our Church ſays to this purpoſe; * '*If there be* '*no Salvation for Infants in the ordinary way of the Church, but* '*by Baptiſm; and this appears in Scripture, as it doth; then out of* '*all doubt the Conſequence is moſt evident out of that Scripture;* '*that Infants are to be Baptiz'd, that their Salvation may be cer-* '*tain; for they which cannot help Themſelves, muſt not be left only* '*to Extraordinary help, of which we have no Aſſurance, and for* '*which we have no Warrant at all in Scripture, while we in the mean* '*time neglect the ordinary way and means Commanded by Chriſt*; give me leave to add here, that if Children ſhou'd Live to be Men, and to be bred up in the Knowledge and profeſſion of the Chriſtian Religion, and yet at laſt dye in the neglect of Baptiſm, to believe ſuch men may be Saved, is no Act of Charity, but of the higheſt Preſumption; and whilſt ſome pretend to be thus Charitable to men, they are highly injurious to Almighty God, whoſe Sacred Laws and particularly this of Baptiſm are not to be diſpenc'd with, to gratify the Negligence and Folly of Adult and profeſt Chriſtians; and their not being convinced

A. B. * *Lauds Conference* §. 15th. *numb.* 4.

Men ſhou'd take heed of dying unbaptiz'd leſt they ſhou'd be Damn'd.

clearly it was their Duty, will be found a weak and insufficient Plea at the Day of Judgment for their Final neglect of it; therefore pray take heed of such ill * Casuists, who say God will save such men as live and die, in this great Sin of Omission; of which perhaps the true Reason is; that many of their own Party live and dye without Baptism; and they are loath to speak out, and say they dyed in a Damnable condition, lest they shou'd Frighten others that are alive and unbaptiz'd back into our Church, where this great Ordinance is not so Scandalously and dangerously omitted.

* *Mr.* Keach *R. G. pag.* 161. *Many call'd Annabaptists dye without Baptism.*

P. Sir I hope in God I shall never trust my Conscience with such blind Guides; but to return to the last Objection, is it not absur'd to say Parents may Save or destroy their Children?

The Church and Ministers thereof by Preaching excommunication and Absolution do as much save and destroy their members as Parents do their children by Baptizing or not Baptizing them.

M. This I have in part answer'd already; but have this further to add; pray where lies the Absurdity, if we shou'd say that men may Instrumentally and Eventually save and destroy others; do's not St. *Paul* Affirm the same of himself, and other Ministers of Christ *Jesus*? 2 *Cor.* 2. 15. 16. we are unto God a sweet savour of Christ in them that are Saved, and in them that Perish; to the one we are the Savour of Death unto Death; and to the other the Savour of Life unto Life; and do's not our Lord say the same to his Apostles? Whosoever's Sins ye remit they are remitted unto them; and whosoevers Sins ye retain, they are retained; *Joh.* 20. 23. And do's he not likewise say the same to his Church? *Mat.* 18. 18. Whatsoever ye shall bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on Earth shall be loosed in Heaven; now may we not as well Argue against the Ordinance of Preaching, and against the Censures of the Church by Excommunication and Absolution; that these things ought to be lain aside, because they put it into the Power of men to Save and to Destroy *i. e.* to be eventual and Instrumental Means of both; wherefore let this Author leave off his Preaching in order (as he pretends) to save Souls; and let *him leave off his Pronouncing* * *Anathamas against a whole Council assembled and assisted by the Spirit of God*; or else his own Argument turns upon him, and he himself is such a *Soul-saving and destroying man*, as he will not allow any other Person to be in the whole World; but pray Sir what is your next Objection?

* *Mr.* Keach *calls it the Cursed Decree of the milevetan councill. in his R. R. pag.* 129.

P. My

P. My ninth Objection is this. They * wonder what Faith it is we ſuppoſe to be in Infants, for the ſake whereof we do Baptize them! Whether it be the Faith of the Church? or is it an imputative Faith from the Parents? or is it the Faith of the Sureties? Upon which this Objector breaks out into admiring and Paſſionate Rapture; *wonder O Heavens!* (ſays he) *and be aſtoniſh'd O Earth! are theſe thy Teachers O England!*

* *Mr. K. R. R. p. 92.*

M. Why Sir what's the matter with this man? What damnable Doctrine do we Preach? is this ſo? that one ſhall receive ſome benefit by anothers Faith? was not the little Daughter of *Jarius* rais'd from Death to Life again, for the ſake of her Fathers Faith? *Mat.* 5. 36. where Chriſt ſays to him; be not affraid, only believe; and immediately wrought a Miracle on the Dead Damoſel (who therefore cou'd not then have Faith of her own to procure it) in bringing her to Life again; was not an evill Spirit caſt out of the Son for the ſake of the Fathers Faith? *Mat.* 9. 23. *Jeſus* ſaid unto him, if thou can'ſt believe, all things are poſſible to him that believeth; and ſtraight way the Father of the Child cryed out, Lord I believe, help Thou my unbeleif; and forth with the Miraculous cure was effected on the Child *ver.* 25, 26, 27. Is this man fit to be a Teacher that wonders for this? Who calls on the Heavens and the Earth to be aſtoniſh'd with him at our Church and her Paſtors for Teaching the ſame Doctrine our Lord *Jeſus* did? *viz.* that he diſpenſeth Temporal yea and Spiritual Bleſſings for the ſake of the Parents and Friends Faith; let him leave off wondering *and Anſwer this which I cou'd never ſee Anſwer'd nor ſo much as mention'd in their Books*; or I ſhall conclude he is not able to anſwer it.

His 9th objection from the variety of our reaſons for infant Baptiſm anſwer'd.

Chriſt did work Spiritual and corporal cures on children for the ſake of the Parents and friends faith, and for the ſake of the ſame why may they not be Baptiz'd.

P. 'Tis wiſely done of them not to meddle with Objections that will be too hard for them; but my Author go's on —Have they (*i.e.* Children) a juſtifying Faith? or a Dogmatical Faith? Some ſay 'tis a Phyſical ſome a Metaphyſical, and ſome a Hyperphyſical Faith, ſome ſay they are borne Believers, others that they are made Believers by Baptiſm; Sir what ſay you to all this?

M. This looks like a Mighty objection; and the objector looks big and ſwells upon it, and in a Trimphant and Rapturous manner flouriſhes with it once and again, and a third time as if it were

These men assign several reasons for Womens receiving the Lords Supper yet do not think this variety an objection against it.

unanswerable; But alas! Sir when examin'd and consider'd there is nothing in it; for if there can be several reasons assign'd for Infant Baptism, and some stick to one Reason, some to another, do's this variety of reasons (which are not exclusive of one another) destroy the Institution? No, certainly; if it did, it wou'd likewise overthrow Womens communicating in the Lord's Supper, because these men assign several and different reasons for it. Some say Women may be admitted to this Ordinance by vertue of that Precept 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. Let a man examine himself *&c.* because they suppose the Woman is included in the Man; some insist upon an other text of the same Apostle 1. *Cor.* 12, 13. We have bin all made to Drink into one Spirit; which they suppose to be meant of the Sacramental Cup: And that Women hence have a right to drink of it; others think it better to stick to good Consequences from Scripture, then to insist upon expres Scripture proofs; and say, because Women were Disciples they had a right to the Lord's Supper, and therefore did partake of it; and that they might do, altho' they had never bin Baptiz'd; others deny this; and say they were Disciples and Baptiz'd, and therefore partook of this Ordinance; others again say that because *Mary* the Mother of *Jesus* and other good Women were of the number of the one hundred and Twenty Disciples who brake bread with the three Thousand that were added to them; therefore Christian Women ought to receive the Lords Supper; now may I not retort all the objectors Queries upon him concerning Womens qualifications for This which he has made concerning Childrens qualifications for the other Ordinance? and demand, *how long his Trumpet shall give an uncertain sound? nay may I not fall into a Rapture? Wonder O Heavens! And be astonish'd O Earth! Are these thy tolerated Licens'd Teachers O England? let them agree upon the reason for Womens receiving the Lord's Supper, and we will agree upon the reason for Childrens receiving Baptism.*

P. Perhaps some of them will say; they will not abide by any one of these reasons singly, but take them altogether, and then they fairly conclude the Lawfulness of Communicating Women.

M. May not we also say the same? we will not stick to this, or that, to a third or fourth reason, but insist on all together, and

and then they clearly prove our point; we have *Scripture proofs and good Conſequences thence for Infants Baptiſm, and becauſe of the Church's Faith, the Parents Faith, the Sureties Faith, and their own Faith we do Baptize them.*

P. But they ſay their Scripture proofs and Conſequences thence are better Evidence, for the one than our's are for the other.

M. They may ſay what they pleaſe, and ſo may we too, but after all we muſt leave others to Judge who ſpeaks moſt reaſon they or we.

P. But what ſay You to their Scripture proofs for Womens Communcating? do's not that text of St. *Paul* prove it? 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. Let a man examine himſelf; muſt not the Woman be included in that expreſſion?

M. Sir This is but a Conſequence drawn from the Signification of the Greek word which we tranſlate [man] and they ſay alſo ſignifies a woman; but this is no clear proof that the *Greek* word *here* do's ſignifie [both] unleſs it were always ſo uſed in the new Teſtament; but that it is not; but ſometimes uſed to ſignify [a man] *Excluſive of a Woman*, as in the ſame Epiſtle 1. *Cor.* 7. 1. It is good for a man not to touch a Woman; the ſame *Greek* word is here us'd to ſignify [a man] which cannot comprehend the Woman which he is advis'd not to touch; and is put in oppoſition to her; ſo that for the Man to Comprehend the Woman is not an Abſolutely neceſſary and infallible conſequence; unleſs it always did; which it do's not, as I have prov'd from one inſtance, and cou'd eaſily produce more, if there were need of it.

The Greek word for [*Man*] *is ſometimes ſo reſtrain'd as to exclude the woman.* 1. *cor.* 7. 1.

P. But what think you of that other text? 1. *Cor.* 12, 13. We have bin all made to Drink into one Spirit; do's not this prove that women may receive the Lords Supper?

M. Sir this is a more uncertain and fallible proof than the former; for to make this a good Conſequence they muſt prove the Drinking here muſt Neceſſarily be underſtood of drinking the Sacramental Cup, and not of a Spiritual Drinking of the word of God and recieving it into the Soul by Faith; as 'tis underſtood *Joh.* 6. 53. where the word is the ſame in the original; and if Women are included in this phraſe, [*we have bin all made to Drink into one Spirit*] why are not Children likewiſe in-

1. cor. 12. 13. *is as good a proof for Infant-Baptiſm as for Womens receiving the Lord's ſupper.*

included in this phraſe; [*we are all Baptiz'd in one Body*] *i. e.* made members of Chriſt's Myſtical Body (which is his Church) by Baptiſm? Certainly Children may as well be Comprehended in the *one* as Women in the *other* part of the Verſe; and then we have gain'd a good Argument hence for Infant Baptiſm.

P. But if their Scripture proofs fall ſhort, what think you of their Conſequences drawn thence; do not they prove the point? *Women were Diſciples*; *Women were Baptized*; *and therefore broke Bread*; *for all who were true Diſciples of Chriſt and Baptiz'd? had an undoubted right to the Lord's Supper*; can you deny ſuch a Conſequence as this?

M. What if we ſhou'd? I am ſure they are not more concluſive than ours for Baptizing Believers Children; in one part of his Argument, the Objector ſays women were Diſciples; in another all who were true Diſciples; now what do's he mean by theſe different and doubtful terms? [Diſciples and True Diſciples] may profeſt Diſciples tho' they be Hypocrites, be admitted to Baptiſm and Conſequently to the Lord's Supper? If ſo; what need was there of putting in *True* Diſciples afterwards? the truth is; he do's not know how to form his Argument; and contradicts himſelf in it: ſometimes he allows ſuch Perſons as appear to be Diſciples, and yet really are not, to be Baptiz'd; ſometimes he rejects ſuch; and * ſays 'tis *not every Faith, but a true Faith that muſt qualify them for Baptiſm*; *they muſt believe with all their Hearts, before they can have a ſufficient Title to it.* But ſuppoſing theſe Women to be true Diſciples, and that they had an undoubted right to the Lords Supper; how do's he prove that they made uſe of this right? a perſon may have right to a thing, and yet voluntarily quit it; or elſe by *ſome unhappy Circumſtances be debar'd of it*; we read indeed that the Women were at Prayer with the twelve Apoſtles at one of their Meetings; but that they were preſent at any other Meeting, or at this of the one Hundred and Twenty Diſciples when St. *Peter* preach'd among them, there is no mention of it; but rather an intimation they were not there; ſince he begins his Sermon thus, Men and Brethren, the *word in the Greek* in its natural import ſignifies *men excluſive of women*: Neither do's it appear that the three Thouſand converted by St. *Peter's* Sermon re-

* *Mr.* K. *Gold refind pag.* 143. 143.

His conſequences from Act. 1. *and* 2. *chapt. no demonſtrations for Women's recieving the Lords ſupper.*

recieved the Lord's Supper all together; or that the women were among them; nor that this breaking of bread must of necessity be the Lords Supper; when this phrase is not so understood in all places of the Scripture; and for ought they can prove may not be so meant in this; for *Luk.* 24. 30. 35. 'Tis said Christ after his Resurrection when he appear'd to the Disciples, and sat at Meat with them, took bread, and Blessed it, and brake, and gave to them, and that he was known of them in *Breaking of Bread*, which was not, cou'd not be the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; because Christ administred that but once, and when he did, declar'd he wou'd never administer it any more: *Luk* 22. 16. *Mat.* 26. 29. And if this breaking of Bread in the *Acts* of the Holy Apostles was not recieving the Lords Supper what is become of their proofs for Women's Recieving it? and how are their Consequences for it any better than ours for Childrens recieving Baptism?

P. I confess Sir what you have said is so plausible, that I believe it will be hard for them to reply to it; but however is it not a prejudice against Infant Baptism that we are not agreed about the Reasons of it?

M. None at all; since there are different Opinions about things that are more expresly commanded than this; as the *non-resistance* of the *Suprem Powere Rom.* 13. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. which some affirm is to be understood of the *Person* that is *Lawfully* vested with it; some of the Person that is *Possess'd* (tho' not Lawfully) of it, and some of the *Laws* only, and that the Person is to be *resisted* let his Title be what it will, if he do's *not govern according to Law*; and a great deal has bin written of late, *pro and con* on this Subject; and yet St. *Paul*'s and our Church's Doctrine stands firm notwithstanding; that *'tis not Lawful to resist the Supreme Power on any pretence whatsoever*; nay do not they themselves contradict themselves as well as one an another? This Objector says, * *The Remedy or Medicine which is Christ's* ** *Blood, we deny not but dying Infants may be capable of*; *and yet in the very next Page he says,* * *no Child can have the Benefit of the Sovereign Remedy (i. e. Christ's Blood) because not capable to believe, by Reason men must recieve it by Faith or perish:* He also says, * *That the Infants of Believers (as such) under the Gospel are not in Covenant with God.* And yet a little after he says,

** Mr. Keach Rect. Rect. pag. 88. and 89.

His contradictions.

* *But*

* pag. 40. and 57. * *But leſt any ſhou'd think that we ſhut out dying Infants from having benefit by Chriſt, I anſwer, I doubt not but God might comprehend them in that glorious Covenant and compact made between him and our ſurety in the Covenant of Redemption*; He ſays again, * *That pious Parents have no cauſe to doubt, but that their Infants who die (tho' not Baptiz'd) are happy*; and yet in the next page affirms * *That many godly People's Children die out of the Covenant*; He ſays again, * *That Infant Baptiſm is not a Soul damning Error*; and yet in the very ſame breath and next words affirms * *That it tends to deſtroy too far the Nature of the holy Sacrament of Baptiſm, and ſo alſo a right Goſpel Church according to the Apoſtolical conſtitution*; He ſays likewiſe, * *When Children are by the Grace of God effectually called, we deny not, but that you may Baptize them*; and yet afterwards aſſerts; *ſhou'd God tell us which Infants hearts and Natures he has thus renew'd, yet that can be no ground or warrant to us to give them the Sacrament of Baptiſm, no more than the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.*

** pag. 208 and 209.

** pag. 140.

P. Truly all theſe ſeem to be ſo many Contradictions;

M. I know not what elſe you can call them; but let this inſolent Author be agreed with himſelf about our *being a Church* or not *a Church of Chriſt*; about Children's *being in Covenant* or not *in Covenant with God*; about *Baptizing regenerate Children* or *not Baptizing them*; and whether the *Lord's Supper ought to be adminiſtred to ſuch regenerate Children*? or elſe let him reconcile theſe Contradictions; and no doubt but we ſhall be agreed about the Reaſons of Infant Baptiſm, and fairly reconcile them: but if we cou'd not, that wou'd not make it unlawful; ſince they do not agree among themſelves about ſinging Pſalms; ſome few of their Congregations being for it; but the far greater number againſt it, and thoſe that follow as well as thoſe that oppoſe this Apoſtolick practice may do it on different grounds; is ſinging Pſalms therefore unlawful, and no Divine Inſtitution, becauſe themſelves are not yet and perhaps will never be agreed about it?

Moſt of the Annabaptiſts are againſt ſinging of Pſalms.

P. But pray Sir if it be not too great a digreſſion what have you to ſay for the Lawfulneſs of ſinging Pſalms?

M. We have the Example of our Saviour and his Twelve Apoſtles, who ſung an Hymn at the receiving the Lord's Supper *Mat.* 26. 20. 30. We have the Example of *Paul* and *Silas*, who

who at midnight and amidst their Bonds sung praises unto God, and with so loud a Voice, that the other Prisoners who were in the outer rooms of the Jaile heard them. *Act.* 16. 25. and these Examples we have likewise inforc'd with Commands *Col.* 3. 16. let the Word of Christ dwell richly in you with all Wisdom, teaching and admonishing one another in Psalms and Hymns and Spiritual Songs *&c.* and *Ja.* 5. 13. is any one merry let him Sing Psalms; now with what face can these men demand an Example of Infant Baptism from Scripture, and pretend they wou'd imitate it, when there are so many Examples of Singing Psalms to be found there, besides precepts, to th t purpose, and they refuse to follow them in a suitable practise?

Scripture Examples and precepts for Singing Psalms.

P. I confess this is a heavy Charge, and I know not well what they can say to it; but some of them to excuse the matter as well as are they are able, pretend the Psalms of *David* are many of them improper for our Christian Assemblies, containing such matter in them, in which we are not concern'd, and cannot joyn; such are *David*'s imprecation of the Divine vengeance upon his Enemies for whose Conversion and welfare we Christians are bound to pray; and therefore they think it better to let the Psalms alone then to sing them.

M. This I know is the common pretence and 'tis no more but a pretence; For 1*st.* granting what they say to be true, that some of the Psalms contain such direful imprecations, there are some of them that have them not; and amidst such variety, these may be Sung, and those omitted.

The First pretence against Singing Psalms from the imprecations that are in them answer'd.

2*ly.* Those direful imprecations are but so many Prophetical predictions of such terrible Judgments as wou'd befal the implacable Enemies of God's Church and People; for *David* knew by the Spirit of God that this wou'd be their Fate; and therefore those passages in the Psalms which we translate by way of Wishing; *let* God arise, *let* his Enemies be scatter'd, *let* the wicked perish, shou'd more properly be rendred by way of Prophecying; God's Enemies *will* be scatter'd, the wicked *shall* Perish; the original Language admitting both Translations; and even whilst we are singing such a Psalm of imprecations, we may exercise onr minds in the Consideration of God's Wrath and Justice upon all obstinate and impenitent unbelievers; and withal rejoyce in the Lord that 'tis not our Lot to be of that Number.

The Books of Moſes and the prophets have the like imprecations and yet are to be read and ſo may the Pſalms be Sung notwithſtanding.

3*ly*. This is as good an objection againſt reading or hearing the Scriptures of the other Prophets, which are not without ſuch direful Imprecations, and therefore there muſt be too much, or elſe there can be nothing in it; and if notwithſtanding this we may, and ought to Read *Moſes* and the Prophets; why may, and ought we not on the ſame Grounds to ſing *Davids* Pſalms? and conſequently theſe Men muſt lay aſide the uſe of the Bible, or elſe they muſt ſing theſe Pſalms, which are ſuch an excellent part of it.

P. Sir I like ſinging very well, and think it is our Duty, tho' I have often wiſh'd that in our Parochial Churches our people ſung with more Skill and Judgment than they Commonly do.

M. I wiſh as you do, but we cannot expect that Muſick in Country Churches which they have in Cathedrals; and if we had a great many wou'd not like it; however I hope we all ſing with good Hearts, and then 'tis no great matter if it be but with ordinary Voices.

The 2d. pretence from Ja. 5. 13. anſwer'd

P. But they ſtart another Objecton from *Jam*. 5. 13. pretending they are not oblig'd to ſing, becauſe the Apoſtle there requires it only of ſuch Chriſtians as are merry, and in a Chearful diſpoſition; is any Merry? let him ſing Pſalms.

Singing a Chriſtian duty as well as Prayer.

M. But 1*ſt*. are theſe men never Merry? never in a Chearfull condition? If they are ſo at any time, by their own Argumeut they ought to Sing; what are they not Chearfully diſpos'd at their Recieving the Lord's Supper, which is ſo proper a time for their rejoycing in the Lord? And is therefore call'd the Euchariſt; I am ſure they have our Lord's and his Diſciples example for it, who all ſung an Hymn before that great Solemnity was over; *Mat*. 26. 30. And why do they not follow their examples in this? 2*ly*. At this rate of arguing we muſt never Pray but when we are in an Afflicted condition, becauſe the Apoſtle joyns them both together; is any Afflicted? Let him pray; is any Merry? Let him ſing Pſalms; and if we are not to ſing but when we are in Joyful and Pleaſant circumſtances, no more are we to pray but when we are in Calamitous ones; and if the one cannot be St. *James* his meaning, no more can the other; the truth is, the Apoſtle in this place intimates that *there are ſome times more Seaſonable for theſe Duties than other; and the moſt Seaſonable time for Prayer is Affliction*;

if

if ever Men will Pray, that is the time; and the most Seasonable time for singing is when we are merry, and in a Chearful disposition; If ever men will sing that is the time; yet both these are moral Duties which we are equally oblig'd to perform as long as we Live; and if there is any difference, it is in respect of their duration; wherein singing has the advantage; for that shall last when Praying ceases, I mean in Heaven, where there will be no such thing as Prayer, because there is then no further need of it; but *Singing will continue and be part of the Employment as well as Happiness of the Glorifyed Saints*; they sing the Song of *Moses* the Servant of God *Rev.* 15. 3. They sing *Allelujah*, Salvation, and Glory, and Honour, and Power unto the Lord Our God *Rev.* 19. 1.

Singing will continue when Praying ceases.

Praying a duty on earth Singing a duty in Heaven.

P. All these are clear Proofs for singing Psalms, or Hymns, but before you dismiss this Subject pray resolve me whether the singing in our Parish-Churches be such as was Practiced by the Primitive Christians?

M. Whether it be or not 'tis not so very material; but to give you the best Satisfaction I can in this point I must tell you; that I believe the Ancient way of singing was like that which is perform'd in our Cathedrals, wherein the Quire being divided into two parts, the people mutually answered one another; the Præcentor (like our parish Clerk) beginning the Tune, and the rest following after by turns on either side; This was the Practise of the Eastern Church in *Ignatius* and *Flavianus* St. *Basils* and *Chrysostoms* time, and in the Western Church too in the days of St. *Ambrose*, who us'd it in *Milan*, and with such Divine Hymns and Psalms, supported the Peoples Spirits Amid st the *Arrian* Persecutions, concluding every one of them with a *Doxology* to the ever *Blessed Trinity* in defence of the Orthodox Faith, and in Opposition to the *Arrians* who denyed the *Son and Holy Ghost to be God*; and in *Imitation of it* we conclude every Psalm with the like *Doxology*, the Minister saying or singing *Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and the Holy Ghost*; and the People answering by Turns *As it was in the Beginning, is now and ever shall be, World without End*; *Amen.* And St. *Austin* confesses that he was so taken with this sort of Psalmody which he heard in the Church of *Milan*, that his Soul was

The Antiphonal and alternate way of Singing Practised in the Greek and Latine Church.

* *Dr. Cave in the life of St.* Basil *pag.* 228. *and in the life of St.* Chrysostom. *pag.* 476. *and in the life of St.* Ambrose *pag.* 395. 396. *and of St.* Ignatius *p.* 102.

Raviſh'd with it, and tranſported thereupon with Divine Affections and cou'd not forbear ſhedding abundance of Tears.

P. But in this alternate way of ſinging (which you ſay is ſo Ancient and I perceive is ſtill practiſed in our Cathedrals) ſome may pretend Women ought not to bear a part becauſe they are forbid to ſpeak in the Church; 1 *Cor.* 14. 34.

M. This very objection I have heard made againſt Womens repeating the Reſponſes and reading every other verſe of the Pſalms in the Church; and indeed it is as *good* againſt womens *ſinging* as *reading* the Pſalms *i.e. Concluſive* againſt *neither*; for notwithſtanding this prohibition of St. *Paul* women may thus ſpeak, and ſing too in the Church, or elſe they cou'd not ſay *Amen* at the end of the Prayers, which the ſame Apoſtle injoyns all, the unlearned as well as the learned, and conſequently the Women as well as the Men; 1 *Cor.* 14. 16.

Women forbid to Teach but not to Sing or uſe the Reſporſes in the Church any more than to ſay Amen to the Prayers.

P. What then is the meaning of that paſſage, that women muſt keep ſilence and not Speak in the Church?

M. The ſame St. *Paul* explains it in another place; *I ſuffer not a women to Teach*: 1 *Tim.* 2. 12. *i.e.* women muſt not take upon them to Preach and expound the Holy Scriptures in the Church, which belongs only to men; and not to all Men neither, but to ſuch only as are Lawfully call'd and ordain'd to the Holy Function; 'Tis this *miniſterial Teaching* which St. *Paul forbids the women*, and will not ſuffer them to do it;

P. But if this be his meaning; do's not that great Apoſtle contradict himſelf in allowing the women to pray, and Prophecy in the Church? 1. *Cor.* 11. 5.

M. Praying and Prophecying is not here meant of ſuch praying and Preaching, as is the pecular work of Lawful Paſtors but only of ſuch praying and ſinging wherein the whole Congregation joyns with him; *Prophecying* here being put for *ſinging Pſalms or Hymns* as it is in ſeveral other places of Scripture, particularly, 1 *Sam.* 10. 5. Where *Samuel* told *Saul*; Thou ſhalt meet a company of Prophets coming down from the high place with a Pſaltery and a Tabret, and a Pipe, and a Harp before them, and they ſhall Prophecy *i. e.* they ſhall *ſing* (as the *Chaldee* paraphraſe reads it) and the Spirit of the Lord ſhall come upon thee, and Thou ſhalt Prophecy *i. e.* ſhalt *praiſe God* in ſome Divine Hymn with them (as the *Chaldee* hath it)

Prophecying in Scripture put for Singing Pſalms or Hymns as 1 *Sam.* 10. 5. 1 *cor.* 11. 5. *So Dr.* Hammond *interprets theſe texts.*

1. *Chro.*

1. *Chro.* 25. 1. *David* ſeperated the Sons of *Aſaph*——who ſhou'd Prophecy with harps with Pſalteries and with Cymbals. and *Luk.* 1. 67. *Zacharias* was filled with the Holy Ghoſt and Prophecyed *i. e.* was ſtired up in an extraordinary manner to Compoſe and ſing the Divine Hymn that there follows *ver.* 68. 69. *&c.* So that Women as well as Men may, and ought to ſing, and bear a part in praiſing God; ſo they did in St. *Paul*'s time, *and ſo they did in the Emperor* Trajan's *Reign, when the Chriſtians by reaſon of Perſecution met together before day, and ſung or ſaid a Pſalm by Turns to Chriſt as God,* as * *Pliny* tells us; And we practiſe this *alternate reading* the Pſalms in our Pariſh Churches; and I wiſh we cou'd the *alternate ſinging* too, and that we had a *new Tranſlation* of the Pſalms in order to it; That of *Sternhold* and *Hopkins* being *defective in many reſpects*; ſome *expreſſions therein being obſolete and ſcarce now intelligible* as

Alternate Singing and reading the Pſalms us'd in Pliny's time.

* *Plin. lib.* 10. *Ep.* 97.

Pſalm 25. 20. *Me from mine Enemies* ſhend.
Pſ. 28. 4. *Let them receive their* meed.
ver. 5. *His Law ne yet his* lore.
Pſ. 73. 5. *When other men be* ſhent.

See Mr. Rich. Goodridge's *ingenious preface to his excellent Tranſlation of the Pſalmes.*

Where the words *ſhend* and *ſhent*, *meed* and *lore* (which are more than once repeated with ſundry other of the like nature) are hardly underſtood by any of the People. Some expreſſions are *too mean* and *contemptible*, as

Pſalm 26. 6. *This is the* brood *of Travellors*
Pſ. 89. 21. *Him King of all the* Rout.

Where the Words *Brood* and *Rout* are *unworthy* of *Jacob's pious off-ſpring* and of *David*'s *Loyal Subjects* of whom they are ſpoken.

Some expreſſions are ſo *ſuperfluous* that 'tis *abſurd to mention* them as

That of Sternhold *and* Hopkins *an ill Tranſlation of them.*

Pſalm 115. 6. *And they have* Ears joyn'd to their Head.
Pſ. 132. 3. *Nor the* Eyes *in* my Head.

Where the Phraſes [*joyn'd to their Head*, and in *their Head*] might well have been omitted becauſe the Head is the place where

where the Ears and Eyes are always ſeated. And ſome expreſſions are *too light and unbecoming the Majeſty of God*; as

Pſalm 74. 12. *O pluck it out and be not ſlack*
To Give thy Foes a Rap.

Which is more like the repreſentaion of *Childrens play* than of the *Almighty's taking Vengeance on wicked Men*; But notwithſtanding theſe and many more ſuch odd expreſſions I doubt the Common people are ſo fond of their *old Tranſlation*, and their *old way of ſinging it*, that 'twill be hard to perſwade them to ſubmit to the Alteration of either; however till this can be accompliſh'd, I hope they will chooſe ſuch Pſamls as have no offenſive paſſages in them, and ſing them with a good Heart; and That will be more acceptable to Almighty God, than to ſing the beſt compoſed Hymns with a skillful Voice when the Heart is wanting; for St. *Paul* prefers ſinging with the Spirit before ſinging with underſtanding; 1 *Cor.* 14. 15. *but that is Heavenly Muſick indeed, when both go together.*

P. Singing (be it which way it will, either alternate, as That in Cathedrals or not Alternate, as That in our pariſh Churches, be it according to the old or new Tranſlation) I am ſatisfied that it is a Duty of perpetual obligation, and theſe Men's not ſinging at all is ſuch a plain neglect of it, as they can never anſwer or excuſe; and I wonder any Chriſtian will joyn with ſuch in Religious Worſhip, who live and allow themſelves in this known Sin of Omiſſion?

Not Singing Pſalms a mark of Antichriſt.

M. So do I wonder too; but more that they Clamour againſt our *Ceremonies* as *Anti-Chriſtian*, and all the while continue themſelves in an *Anti chriſtian practiſe*; It being Prophecy'd by one * of the antient Martyrs that *in the days of Anti-Chriſt Lyturgy ſhou'd be extinguiſh'd und Pſalmody ceaſe*; and therefore however they pretend to hate him, if this be a ſign of his Coming, Anti-Chriſt is come and dwells among them; but pray Sir when will your objections end?

* *Hippolitus Bib. pat. græc. Tom.* 11. *pag.* 357.

P. I ſhall urge but two more becauſe I doubt I have already tyred your patience, and I have done.

M. Alas! Sir you know I have *greater things to Exerciſe my Patience*, and therefore you need not fear, it will not be overcome

come with ſo *ſmall a matter* as this; but what are your two laſt Objections? I preſume thoſe are your *ſtrongeſt*, being kept for a *reſerve*, and to *conclude the Fight*.

P. That you will be ſenſible of when you ingage with them, but for my part I never lov'd to diſpute for Diſputations ſake, nor to contend for Victory but the Truth.

M. Our Oppoſers will ſay the ſame too, tho' they always confute themſelves by their Peeviſh and Wrangling diſcourſes; but I have a better Opinion of you, or elſe ſhou'd have ſpared the pains I have taken with you.

P. I hope you will take a great deal more; but firſt let me have your Anſwer to my Tenth objection which is their interpretation of 1. *Cor.* 7. 14. Elſe were your Children *unclean* but now are they *Holy*; which theſe * Men ſay is meant of *Matrimonial* and not of *Federal Holineſs, and that the Husbands being Sanctified by his Wife, is no more than his being Lawfully or Chaſtly uſed as a Husband without Fornication in Reſpect of his own Wife, And therefore this Sanctification was ſuch as both were capable of, tho' unbelievers, and in all Probability the Apoſtle ſuppoſes both parties Husband and Wife, (of whom he here ſpeaks) to be unbelievers.*

* *Mr. K. R. R. pag.* 115.

M. I thought I had ſaid enough to this Objection * formerly but becauſe you have now added more to it, I ſhall return this further anſwer.

* *Relig. conf. pag.* 11, 12.

1*ſt.* Such an interpretation is Contrary to the very queſtion which the *Corinthians* had put to St. *Paul*, which * they allow to be this; whether *the believing Husband might live or Cohabit with the unbelieving Wife*? Now if this was the queſtion put to St. *Paul*, his anſwer to it had been Abſur'd and Impertinent, to tell them that unbelievers were Sanctified *i. e.* Chaſtly uſed by one another in Marriage, which was not the *queſtion* nor the the Scruple they made, and therefore this cou'd be no *ſatisfactory Anſwer* to it.

* *Mr. K. R. R. pag.* 114.

His Tenth objection from the interpretation of the 1. cor. 7. 14. *anſwered.*

2*ly.* Such an interpretation is Contrary to what their great Advocate Mr. *Tombs* affirms, who ſays the *Sanctification here of the unbeliever is ſuch a Sanctification as is Parallel with that in* 1. Tim. 4, 5. *Where the Creatures are Sanctified to the pure by the Word and prayer*; and then certainly there is more meant by this Expreſſion than *Matrimonial Sanctification*, which *Infidells had*

Sanctification here (ſays Mr. Tombs *) is ſuch as that of the creatures to the pure in*

1 Tim. 4. 5. and therefore more than Matrimonial.

had, but *were not Capable of the other*, nothing being pure or Sanctified to the unbelieving; as is plain from *Tit.* 1. 15. To them that are defiled and Unbelieving nothing is pure, such are without the word and Prayer as well as without God, and without hope in the World.

The Husband and Wife St. Paul treats of were not both unbelievers being styled by him Brother and Sister and and the one said to save the other which unbelievers cannot do.

3*ly*. Such an interpretation is Contrary to St. *Paul's* meaning; who from other passages in this Chapter which relate to this, and may serve to explain it, do's understand it of *such Married People where one of them was a Believer*, and the *other an unbeliever*; as *ver.* 12. and 15. Where the Man and Wife tho' not called believers, are called *Brother* and *Sister*, which is the same thing, and implys as much; *ver.* 12. If any Brother *i. e.* Christian Brother hath a Wife, that Believeth not *&c. ver.* 13. and the Woman *i. e.* the Christian Sister which hath an Husband that believeth not *&c.* and *ver*, 16. What knowest thou O Wife whether thou shalt *save* thy Husband? and how knowest thou O Man whether thou shalt *Save* thy Wife? and can any one imagine that St. *Paul* meant an *unbelieving Wife* shou'd *Save* an unbelieving Husband, or an *unbelieving Husband* shou'd *Save* an unbelieving Wife, when the same Apostle declares unbelievers to be in a State of Unrightousness and Darkness, and under the Power of *Belial*, and for that reason disswades the *Corinthians* from Marrying with them? * 2 *Cor.* 6. 14, 15. All which I think sufficiently shews such an Interpretation of this Text, [*That Man and Wife here were both unbelievers, and only Matrimonally Holy*] to be *Ridiculous* and *False*; and proves my interpretation of it, [*of Federal Holyness, because one of them was a Believer and for his Sake,*] to be *Genuine* and *true*.

P. But against this he farther Argues why might not the Children of unbelievers be said to be Holy, as well as the Infidel or unbelieving Wife is said to be Sanctified?

The word [*Holy or Sanctifyed*] has three different significations in 1 cor. 7.

M. This question may be fitly Answered by asking another; there is in this Chapter also mention of the unmarryed Woman's being Holy, which is certainly meant of reall Internal Holyness *ver.* 34. now may I not as well demand of him, why may not the *unbelieving Wife and Husband* be said to be *Holy* as well as the *unmarried Christian Virgin?* and *what is the difference between Holy and Sanctified*? yet 'tis plain tho' the same word for [*Holy*] be used

used in all three places yet it must have three different Significations; the unbelieving Wife is only *Civilly or Instrumentally Holy* to her believing Husband; because she is Sanctified to her Husbands use (as all Gods Creatures are) by the word and Prayer; the unmarryed Christian Virgin is *really Holy*; because *'tis said she careth for the things of the Lord that she may be Holy in Body and Spirit*; and the Children there mentioned are *Federally Holy*; because 'tis said; else were they *unclean*; which cannot be meant, else were they *Bastards*; *this wou'd Bastardize all unbelievers Children which is notoriously False*;

the christian Virgin really holy, the unbelieving Wife civilly or instrumentally Holy; the children federally Holy.

P. But what say you to the Authorities which this * man produceth for his Interpretation, particularly St. *Ambrose* * who says the *Children here are Holy because Born in Lawful Wedlock?*

* *Mr. Keach Gold refined p.* 139.

M. Sir he is very *Ignorant* or *unsincere* in this quotation; for that father tho' he says what he is quoted for, do's not stop there, but adds enough to shew he was for having this Text interpreted of Federal Holyness: his words rightly Translated are these; *now are they (your Children) Holy because born in Lawful Marriage, and because they are born under the Worship of the True God, the Creator on the Believing side; for as whatsoever appertains to Idolls by Dedication to them is unclean; so is that Holy which is born under the profession of the True God the Creator*; where 'tis plain that St. *Ambrose* makes one *of the Parents Faith* to be the reason of the *Childrens Holiness*; and then it must be *more* than a *Matrimonial Holiness* or Legitimacy, which he had mention'd just before.

His ignorance or unsincerity in quoting St. Ambrose on 1. cor. 7. 14. and Demosthenes.

P. This is foul play indeed.

M. This is not the only Instance of it, I can give you another such; * He quotes *Stephanus* Dictionary for observing out of *Demosthenes* a passage, where the Priest says, [*I am Holy and pure from the Company of Man*] but the words which Immediatly follow and make against him he leaves out; [*and from all other things which might Pollute me*] This Mr. *Marshal* Charg'd upon Mr. *Tombs*, from whom I presume this Authour had it, and yet is he Guilty of the same fault; so that [*Holy*] in *Demosthenes* imports a *Freedom* from *other vices which defile the Soul as well as from uncleanness*; and so it do's in *Thess.* 4. 7. it signifies *other Christian Vertues* as well as *Chastity*; that no Man go beyond, and defrau'd his Brother in any matter *ver. 6.*

* *Mr. K. R. R. p.* 120.

* *Mr. Marshal's defence of Infant Baptism pag.* 151.

P. Really Sir *this is a ſhrow'd ſign of a bad cauſe to uſe ſuch Tricks to defend it*, but that I may not detain you too long with Objections, of which I begin to grow weary as well as you; my Eleventh and laſt Objection is this. That ſome of the Holy * Fathers tho' born of Chriſtian Parents were not Baptiz'd till they were Twenty or Thirty years Old; as St. *Chryſoſtom* and *Baſil*, *Gregory Nazianzen* and *Jerom*, *Ambroſe* and *Auſtin*; and 'tis likely the Baptiſm of theſe eminent and Pious men wou'd not have been deferred ſo long, had it been the Cuſtom of the Church to Baptize Infants.

* *Mr.* K. *R. R. p.* 132. 133.

His laſt objection from the Adult Baptiſms of ſome of the Holy Fathers anſwered.

M. 1ſt. This Objection is not True as to matter of Fact, for that ſome of thoſe Holy Fathers Parents were *Heathens* when they were born at leaſt it do's not appear from any Authentick Hiſtorian that they all were then *Chriſtians*; the Two moſt antient Writers of St. *Chryſoſtom*'s Life *Socrates* and *Sozomen* ſay nothing of his Parents Religion, whether they were Chriſtians or no? nor any thing of his Baptiſm when it was adminiſtred; and Four latter Greek writers of his Life (which Sir *Henry Savil* caus'd to be bound up in his Edition of that Fathers works) do all unanimouſly agree, that he was firſt Baptiz'd by *Meletius*, and his Parents after him by the ſame hand; I need not relate what all, but only what one of them ſays on this occaſion; *viz. The holy* Meletius *ſucceeeding into the Throne of* Antioch, (i. e. Chryſoſtom) *had recourſe to him with all ſpeed and fervency, requeſting that his very young and tender body might be waſh'd in the water of regeneration, and himſelf preſently and his Parents perſwaded by their conſecrated Child were vouchſafed holy Baptiſm*; and if this be a true account, St. *Chryſoſtom*'s Parents were not Chriſtians at his Birth, nor till after his Converſion; but * St. *Chryſoſtom* himſelf (who is the beſt Author to be relyed upon in this caſe ſays that *his Father's death ſoon followed upon his birth*; *and that about the Twentieth year of his age his Mother was a Chriſtian*; and then ſhe might be Baptiz'd after him; and that might occaſion the miſtake which the Four Greek Writers fell into in affirming them *both* to have been Baptiz'd after their Son; This is *certain*, *that* Chryſoſtom *was ſent a Schollar to a Heathen Maſter and bred up a Heathen under him till he was about twenty years old, and then committed to the care of* Meletius *by whom he was at laſt Baptiz'd*; and if this be the trueſt account, his

St. Chryſoſtom *not born of Chriſtian Parents.*

Sr. H. *Sav. Edit. of* Chryſoſ 8th. *vol.* pag. 159. 269. 295. 574.

* Chryſ. *Orat. ad vid. Jun. Tom.* 6th. *p.* 522. *and de ſacerd. l.* 1. *c. p.* 3. *being ſent a Schollar to a Heathen Maſter and bred up an Heathen under him.*

Hea-

Heathen Education as well as Heathen Parents might be the cauſe why his Baptiſm was ſo long delay'd, and why he did not receive it in infancy; This is all that upon the ſtricteſt enquiry and reſearch I can find of this Father, and therefore wonder from what Author the Objector has it, that *Chryſoſtom* was born of Chriſtian Parents, and ſays This is the *Truer Opinion*; I wiſh he wou'd produce his Author, that the World may judge who has Truth on his ſide.

St. Auſtin not born of Chriſtian Parents, his father a Heathen

P. But what ſay you of St. *Auſtin*? was not He born of Chriſtian Parents.

M. No Sir, he was not; tho' ſome * Authors of note have been ſo far impos'd upon to affirm it; for *Auſtin* himſelf (who is moſt worthy of credit) affirms the Contrary; that *when himſelf was a* * *Lad his Father did not believe in Chriſt, tho' himſelf and Mother and all the houſe beſides did; and that 'twas near the end of his life before ſhe gain'd her Husband to the Chriſtian Faith*; beſides 'tis well known that St. *Auſtin* in his younger years fell into the *Hereſy of the Manichees* (who denyed Chriſt's Humanity and held Two eternal Principles, the one the Author of all Good, the other of all Evil) and continued a long time under it; and under the power too of Youthful Luſts, which he indulg'd himſelf in; and made ſo light of Baptiſm as openly to deride it, as * himſelf confeſſes; on all which accounts 'tis no wonder that *Auſtin*'s Heathen Father at firſt and himſelf afterwards ſo long put off his Baptiſm.

*Poſſidon. in vit. Aug. and Dr. Cave in the Life of St. Ambroſe pag 391.

* Aug. conf. l. 1. p. 11. and lib. 9. cap. 9. lib. 3 c. 11.

* Confeſs. l. 4. c. 3.

2ly. But ſuppoſing all theſe Fathers had been born of Chriſtian Parents (as I have ſhewn you that Two of them were not from good Authority; yet this is no good conſequence; that becauſe ſome few Chriſtian Parents heretofore deferred their Childrens Baptiſm, therefore this was the general practiſe of the Church in that Age; the Objector might as well argue; becauſe the people of his Party delay their Childrens Baptiſm till they come to years of diſcretion, that therefore this is the practiſe of the Church in our age which is a manifeſt and notorious untruth; or *becauſe the* Iſraelites *deferred their Circumciſion in the Wilderneſs* 40 *years that therefore it ought not to be adminiſtred when* 8 *days old.*

The Adult Baptiſm of a few no good conſequence that none were Baptiz'd in infancy.

P. But were any other of theſe Father's Parents Chriſtians at their birth?

M. Ambroſe his Parents were, and perhaps *Baſil's* and *Jerom's*; but this is not ſo clear as to *Gregory Nazianzen*, there being a time when his Father was not a Chriſtian, but an *Hypſiſtarian*, who were a *mongrell Sect*, *partly Jew*, and *partly pagan*; and he might be born before as well as after his Father's renouncing this Sect, his pious Wife being the cauſe of his Converſion, and nothing appearing to the contrary *Our Affirmation* is as good as our *opponents denial.*

Tis not certain that Nazianzen's Father was a Chriſtian at his birth.

P. But how do's it appear that Infant-Baptiſm was the practice of the Church in thoſe Fathers days?

M. From their ſeveral Writings wherein they poſitively affirm it; *Gregory Nazianzen* ſays; * *what will you ſay concerning thoſe that are Children, and neither know the loſs nor are ſenſible of the Grace of Baptiſm? ſhall we alſo Baptize them? yes by all means, if any danger preſs; 'tis better they ſhou'd be Sanctify'd (by which he means Baptiz'd) when they have no ſenſe of it, than that they ſhou'd dye unſeal'd and unitiated*; St. *Chryſoſtom* ſpeaking of the many advantages of Chriſtian Baptiſm, ſays, *for this cauſe* do *we Baptize Children tho' they have not Sins* i. e. *actual Sins* as St. *Auſtin* expounds that expreſſion; and ſpeaking of Infant Baptiſm the ſame St. *Auſtin* ſays, * *This the Church has always had, always retain'd, this it has receiv'd from the Faith of our Anceſtors, this it keeps perſeverently to the end*; *and thereupon lays down this Rule*; *That which the univerſal Church maintains, and was not eſtabliſh'd by Councils, but has always continued, is moſt rightly believ'd to be deliver'd by the Apoſtles Authority.* St. *Jerom* in his Dialogues againſt the Pelagians to the queſtion which *Critobius* propoſes; * *tell me I pray thee why Infants may be Baptiz'd?* makes *Atticus* return this anſwer, *that their Sins may be done away in Baptiſm*; and to his further queſtion; *what ſin have they committed? is any man looſed that is not firſt bound? Atticus* replies; *doſt ask me this? the Evangelical trumpet ſhall anſwer thee* Rom. 5. 14. *Death reigned from* Adam *to* Moſes *over them that had not Sinned after the ſimilitude of* Adam's *tranſgreſſion* &c. *he that is a little one, is looſed in baptiſm from the Bond (of the Sin) of the Parent* &c. *and leſt thou ſhoudſt think I mean this in an Heretical ſenſe, the bleſſed Martyr* Cyprian *in his Epiſtle he wrote to Biſhop* Fidus *concerning Baptizing Infants minds us of theſe things*; St. *Ambroſe* ſays, *Infant Baptiſm was a Conſtitution of our Saviour's, and in his* * *Expoſition*

All theſe ſix Fathers ſtrenuous aſſerters of Infant Baptiſme.

* Greg Nazorat. 40.

* Chryſ. *Hom. ad Neophytos apud St.* Aug. *lib.* 1. *contra pelag. cap.* 2.

* *Aug. De Bap contra Donat lib.* 4. 2. 24.

Hieron l 3. contra pelag.

position of Joh. 3. 5. *Except one be born again of Water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God, he observes that our Lord therein makes no exception of any, no not of the Infant* &c. and by this Scripture he proves *that neither the old proselite nor the Infant native is excepted, because every age is obnoxious to Sin, and therefore every age is meet for the Sacrament*; and lastly St. * *Basil* says the same as I find him quoted by *Vossius* and Mr. *Nat. Homes*; the truth of whose Testimony I do not doubt tho' I have not the Book it self by me to Consult.

* *Amb. de Abra. patr. l. 2. c. 11.*

* *Basil. Exhortat. ad bapt.*

P. But what then was the reason those Fathers Baptism was delay'd till they were Twenty or Thirty years old?

M. The reason of St. *Austin*'s delay we may gather from his own works; either

Their delay of Baptism might proceed from Libertinism.

1*st.* because his Sins wou'd receive a deeper stain and guilt after the Baptismal washing than before it (as some now on the same *Superstitious account* abstain from the *Lord's Supper*) and this might affect *Austin*'s Mother; or

2*ly.* Because he might sin on with the greater Liberty and at a cheaper rate before than after Baptism, and this might prevail upon the unconverted Father, who might be one of those that was for indulging him in his wonted Licentiousness, whose usual saying was; *Let him alone to do what he pleases, he is not yet Baptiz'd*; but this he bewails in the * same place, and shews the unreasonableness of both pretences; To the first he answers; *that there was no reason to delay Baptism for fear of Sinning after it, since there was no necessity for such after Sins, for as much as Baptism puts us into the hands of our Heavenly Father, who is the best security we can have against them*; To the Second, that *as soon as may be after the receiving the wound* (*i. e.* original or actual sin) *either by our own or others help the Plaister* (*i. e. Baptism*) *shou'd be applyed; and the refusal of it for the sake of more Liberty to sin was as unreasonable for the Soul, as 'tis for the Body to receive more wounds, because it is not yet cured*; and these reasons might prevail with the Parents of the other Fathers mention'd in the objection as well as *Austin*'s; for that his Baptism was not delay'd from an opinion of it's unlawfulness in Infancy is evident from his having the *usual Ceremonies* that accompanyed it applyed to him, as *the Cross* &c. and the Ordinance it self in all probability had been administred

* *Aug. confess. l. 1. c. 11.*

adminiſtred at the ſame time had not his Father been a Heathen and againſt it; or elſe

3ly. *The example of Chriſt.*

3*ly.* This preciſe year of *Thirty* might be fix'd upon in *Imitation* of our *Saviour*, who was not Baptiz'd till about that time of his life; as *Conſtantine* the great who liv'd in the ſame age after the ſame example wou'd be Baptiz'd in no other place but *Jordan* (tho' he fail'd thereof) and (if we may credit ſome) St. *Bazil* was Baptiz'd in it; and this conjecture ſeems the more probable when we conſider that theſe Fathers were all *Prieſts*, and ſo (like our Saviour) wou'd have Baptiſm *Immediately* to *precede* their entring on that *Sacred Office*, and to be *Introductory* to it. or

4ly. *Novatianiſm.*

4*ly.* Theſe Fathers Baptiſm might be delay'd from an opinion that prevail'd much in that age *viz.* that Sins committed after Baptiſm were not at all or with great difficulty to be pardon'd grounding it on *Heb.* 6. 4. it is impoſſible for thoſe who were once *enlightned* &c. (which they miſunderſtood of being *Baptiz'd*) if they ſhall fall away to renew them again to Repentance.

5ly. *Fear of perſecution.*

5*ly.* Theſe Fathers Parents might deſer it at firſt and themſelves afterwards for fear of Perſecution; ſince to be Baptiz'd and by ſuch a ſolemn Act to own themſelves Chriſtians was at that time the ready way to Martyrdom, unleſs they wou'd Apoſtatize and renounce the Chriſtian Faith. Or

6ly. *imitation of the Heathen Converts.*

6*ly.* They might delay their Childrens Baptiſm in imitation of the Heathen converts, who by theſe ſeveral ſteps came to receive it; firſt they were rank'd among the *Catechumens* or *Catechized*, next among the *competently qualifyed* and *Candidates* for Baptiſm, and then were admitted to it; and ſo what concern'd the *Children of Pagans* only, To *repent and be Baptiz'd*; to *beleive and be Baptiz'd*; thro' a miſtake thereof or fondneſs for this way they thought did belong to their *own Children.* Or elſe

7ly. *The high eſteem of this ordinance as the moſt complete abſolution, and therefore reciev'd it (like the Lords ſupper) as their Viaticum.*

7*ly.* And laſtly their delaying Baptiſm ſo long, was not from a *Diſregard* but from a *Greater eſteem* of it, they looking on it as the moſt compleat Abſolution they could Recieve, and therefore put it off to their Death-beds, being thence call'd *Clinicks*, and then they were Baptiz'd by way of *Springling* and not *dipping*; and on this Account *Conſtantine* the Great and *Gregory Nazianen's Brother Cæſarius deferr'd* their Baptiſm till they were

were very near the laſt period of their Life, dying preſently upon it; for any one or all of theſe Reaſons thoſe Holy Fathers Baptiſm might be ſo long deferred, and not from any opinion of the unlawfulneſs of Recieving it in Infancy, which was never urg'd or Mention'd in that Age as a Reaſon for delaying it; and indeed that ſo few inſtances occur of Adult Baptiſm is an Argument for Infant Baptiſm and not againſt it.

P. I am ſatisfied and have done with my Objections, and ſhou'd now deſire you to produce your further proofs and Reaſons from Scripture for Infant Baptiſm but that 'tis grown late, and I doubt I have detain'd you too long already.

M. I muſt confeſs that I am almoſt weary with walking and talking ſo much at one time, and the day is quite gone, and I do not care to walk by Night, which I doubt 'twill be before I get home.

P. Beſides 'tis dangerous to be abroad late.

M. I have no reaſon to fear *robbing abroad or at Home, tho' I thank God and Good Friends I want nothing* but more of *the Divine Grace*, of which I think we can never have *too much*; and ſo Sir good night, and I *pray God to Bleſs and keep you* till we meet again.

P. Farewell, *Gods peace be with you.*

The Third Part of a Religious Conference between a Miniſter and Pariſhioner. &c.

Par. I Am very Fortunate to meet you again in the ſame place and near the ſame time I did Yeſterday; I muſt beg you to oblige me with a further Diſcourſe on that Subject we had not then time to finiſh.

Min. I hope you have no more Objections, if you have, pray let me hear them preſently; for it may be out of my way to Anſwer them, when I am Offering my Reaſons and proofs for Infant Baptiſm.

P. I Know none worth the Mentioning, and therefore pray proceed to gratify my requeſt.

M. Sir

M. Sir I have two Scripture proofs to offer, which were omitted in our first Conference;

Mat. 28 19. 20. *a good proof for Infant Bap. tism.*

The first is *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have Commanded you *&c.*

P. But I remember you then said that This and some other precepts did concern grown Believers, and not their Children.

* *Rel. conf. pag.* 19.

M. I said so; but 'tis plain from* those other precepts there Quoted, that I ment [*So far as they require precedent Teaching, Profession of Faith, and Repentance*] these precepts respect grown Believers; and their Children are no way concern'd in them; yet they are *both* included in the general Command, to Baptize all Nations; go ye therefore and Teach *i. e.* grown Believers before you do Baptize, them; but as for their Children, you are to Baptize them first, and Teach them afterwards; and therefore teaching follows Baptizing here as well as go's before it. *ver.* 20.

* *Mr.* K. *R. R. pag.* 29. 30.

P. But to this they except: * are not Pagans, Turks, and Infidels, and their Children a very Considerable part of all Nations? Are these included in Christ's commission tho' not nam'd? you must say they be; or else confess there is nothing in what you say in the least upon this Account.

The Exception against this proof answer'd.

M. But this is a Fallacious and pitiful exception, and shews the Author to be no Disputer of this World; for do's it necessarily follow, because Children are included in all *Disciple'd Nations* (Children being call'd Disciples *Act.* 15. 10. And capable of Discipleship as well as their believing Parents) that therefore *Pagan Parents* who were never *Disciple'd* are likewise comprehended under all *Disciple'd* Nations? 'Tis such *Proselyted Nations* and such only are to be Baptized; and such *Proselyted Nations* Comprehend the *Children* which are so Considerable a part of it, but they do not, they cannot Comprehend *Pagans Turks and Infidels* who were never *Proselited* to the Christian Religion at all; for Christs Commission implys that Nations *i. e.* the Parents therein must be taught or Disciple'd, before either they or their Children are to be Baptiz'd; but this do's exclude and not take in Heathen Parents and their Children; which I think is a sufficient Answer to this Silly and So-

Pagans not comprehended under disciple'd Nations tho Children are.

Sophiſtical exception; for the word which we tranſlate [*Teach*] in the Greek is [*Diſciple*] go, Diſciple all Nations; and that may be done by Baptizing as well as Teaching; as thoſe Jews, Men Women and Children, that were Baptized unto *Moſes*. 1. *Cor*. 10. 2. thereby became the Diſciples of *Moſes* *Joh* 9. 28. and theſe Jewiſh Proſelytes that came to *John's* Baptiſm were made *John's* Diſciples by it; and ſo all that are Baptiz'd into the Chriſtian Faith, are made Chriſt's Diſciples by their Baptiſm; To Baptize Perſons and make them Diſciples being only different Phraſes to expreſs the ſame thing; as *Joh*. 4. 1. 'tis ſaid *Jeſus* made and Baptized more Diſciples than *John*. *i.e*. he did not firſt make by Teaching and then Baptize; but he did both together, and by the Miniſtry of his Apoſtles he Baptiz'd them Diſciples, that being the Form of making them ſuch, and why then may not Children be Diſcipled this way, I mean by being entred into Chriſt's School by Baptiſm in order to their after Learning the leſſons of Chriſtianity? Eſpecially ſince *Iſaiah* prophecyeth of ſuch Children that they ſhall be all taught of God *Chapt* 54, 13. which our Lord applys to Goſpel times wherein it was fulfill'd *Joh*. 6. 45. And the ſame Prophet afterwards mentions Infants among others, that ſhall reap the Benefit of this Goſpel Bleſſing and promiſe; *Iſa*. 65. 20. There ſhall be no more thence an Infant of days, nor an old man that has not filled his days; for the Child ſhall Die an Hundred years old *&c*. *i.e*. Under the Evangelical diſpenſation ſuch as are Infants in days ſhall be aged in grace, otherwiſe how is it poſſible for the *Child* to die *an Hundred years Old*, unleſs the *Inſpirations of the Almighty* (as *Job*. ſpeaks *Chapt*. 32, 8.) did *give him underſtanding*? and by this means he may be rendre'd as capable of Baptiſm, as an old Diſciple that can reckon an hundred years; and the reaſon why God deals ſo Graciouſly with their Children is there ſaid to be the Relation they bear to their Believing Parents. *ver*. 23. ye are ſeed of the Bleſſed Lord and their Off-ſpring with them.

Children diſcipled by Baptiſm; that being an uſual form of making diſciples.

Believers Children taught of God.

P. What is your Text of Scripture to prove this point?

M. It is *Rom*. 11. 16. 1. *pt*. If the root be Holy, ſo are the Branches; in which and the following verſes St. *Paul* compares the Jews to an *Olive Tree*, and the rejecting them for a Seaſon, to the *lopping off its natural Branches*, and the calling of the Gen-

Rom. 11. 16. *another good proof for Infant Baptiſm.*

tiles he resembles to the *Grafting upon this old Stock*, which growing again a fresh, makes up but *one entire Olive Tree*, and root and branches are nourished and grow by the same Sap: By which Similitude that Apostle plainly, intimates that Jews and Christians made up but *one Universal Church*, of which our Lord *Jesus* was the Head; and that Faith in him, was as it were the Sap which gave Life and Nourishment to it; the Consequence of which is, that the same Spiritual priviledges which belong'd to the Children of the Jews, do belong to the Children of the Christians; and then if the former were to be initiated into the Church by Circumcision, so are the latter by Baptism.

* *Mr. K. R. R. pag.* 113.

P. But to This they *except, that then every Believing Parent wou'd be the Root to his natural Off-spring as *Abraham* was a Root to his; which they look on as very absur'd.

The first exception against this proof answer'd

M. But pray where Lies the Absurdity? Might not Parents who were themselves but branches from *Abraham* their Father, be nevertheless Roots to those Children who spring from them? and do's not the Scripture imply as much in calling *Jesse a root*? *Isa.* 11. 1. and the Pslmist in calling *Children Olive-branches*? *ps.* 128. 3. and might not every Parent among the Jews apply Gods promise made to *Abraham* to himself? *Gen.* 17. 7. I will be a God to thee, and to thy Seed; and if every Believer were not a root as *Abraham* was, and might not apply the Promise to himself, how comes it to pass, that this promise was so often renew'd many Hundred years after the death of *Abraham Isaac* and *Jacob*? as *Deut*, 30. 6. *Isa.* 44. 2, 3. *Isa.* 59. 21. which cou'd not be spoken to *Abraham* who was Dead long before; but must be spoken to his Posterity who were then living and to be Roots as he was to their respective Children; nay how comes it to pass, that the Proselite Strangers of all Nations that made a visible profession of the Jewish Religion (of whom *Abraham* was neither the Natural nor Spiritual Father, being neither of the Blood of the Jews, nor all of them of the number of Elect) how comes it to pass that these *Proselite Strangers* (I say) that came in of their own accord to imbrace the Jewish Religion, that they together with their Children were also by Circumcision admitted to visible Church-membership? let them assign any *other Reason* for this besides the *proselited* Parents being a *root* to their Children as *Abraham* was

Every believing parent a root to his Children as Abraham was to his.

to

to his, and he says something; but if he can give no other reason, let him fairly yeild the cause.

P. But they urge farther * that the Jews who were broken off are still the Natural Seed of *Abraham?* and therefore if this Holyness was an External relative Federal Holyness, they are still in that sense Holy as far forth as the Children of a Believing Gentile can be said to be. *Id. p.* 113

M. But this Exception carries its own Confutation along with it; for how can the Jews that are broken off from this Olive Tree (into which the Believing Gentiles are grafted in) have as great a Priviledge of Federal Holyness as they; which is gone with their unbelief? Indeed this Priviledge continued, and descended from Father to Son till the Jews were broken off; but then it ceased and fell away with them; and what tho' they are still *Abraham's* natural Seed? they are not immediately so, but at a great distance; and so the promise do's not belong to them having forfeited their right to it thro' their infidelity; *for as the Jews were first Grafted into this Olive Tree which was together with their Children; so were they afterwards broken off together with their Children from it; and as they were broken off, so are Christians Grafted in together with their Children; and so likewise shall the Jews be Grafted in at their conversion before the end of the world,* i. e. *Parents and Children together as they were at first*; *Rom.* 11. 24. 26. and till this final call of the Jewish Parents how can their Children be as holy as the Children of the believing Gentiles, who are Grafted in in their room, and so partake of the very same Church Priviledges they did before they were broken off?

The Second exception answer'd.

The Jews Now broken off from this root thro unbelief, and therefore not federally holy now as believers Children.

P. But pray Sir what was this *Breaking off* the Apostles speaks of.

M. Your Author durst not say it was from the *Invisible-Church*, lest he shou'd be forc'd to acknowledg a *Falling from Grace*; and yet he says what is as bad; these *Branches* (the Jews) *were all broken off* viz. *for rejecting Christ* (says he) *not broken off from the Election of Grace, for to that they did not belong.*

* *Mr.* Keach *Rest. Rest. p.* 111.

He says the Jews that were broken off did not belong to the election of Grace.

P. How? What must all the Jews be *reprobated and Damn'd?* rather than *own that some of them might fall from Grace?* this is harsh and Uncharitable Doctrine indeed.

M. 'Tis so; but that is nothing with these men to *Damn a few Jews*, who *unchurch all Christendom* and *Damn all the World besides themselves* that comparatively are but a handful of People in it; but to return to our point; If this *breaking off* was not from the *invisible*, it must be from the *Visible Church*; and *therefore in the same manner as the Jews and their Children were unmade must we and our Children be made Members of the visible Church*; neither is it said by St. *Paul* that the *Olive Tree* or the whole *visible Church* of God was destroy'd (as this * man wou'd insinuate, in saying the *Jews were broken off from being any more a Church or People in Covenant with God*) but only that the *branches* were broken off, and not all of them neither, for some (even such as believed in Christ,) continued still in the Olive Tree; and sure that cou'd not deprive their Children, of that Church priviledge which they injoy'd before, no more can it our Children of the like priviledge, who are grafted in upon the same Terms; as you may see *Rom.* 11. 17, 18, 24. Where the Olive Tree *i. e.* the visible Church of God continued after these branches were broken off, and will continue till the branches (the Jews) are grafted in again; and so this Author has only rais'd a great deal of dust to obscure this Illustrious text of Scripture which in spite of all his pretended *openings* and *distinguishings* is another Substantial proof for Infant Baptism.

The Olive Tree i. e. *the visible Church not destroy'd when these branches were broken off.*

* Mr K. R. R. p. 111.

Believers and their children grafted in in the room of the Jews and their children that were broken off.

P. Sir, If you had said, unanswerable, you had not said too much, for I do not see what they can reply, to withstand the force of these two Texts of Scripture; but what are the Reasons you promised to give for it? pray let me heare them.

The first Reason for Infant Baptisme.

M. My First is, because our Lord and his Apostles did not forbid the Baptizing Infants, when there were fair opportunities offer'd, and where one wou'd think they shou'd have forbidden it, had they intended any such thing; and that was at the Inlargment of his Commission to Baptize *Mat.* 28, 19. and when the great point of Circumcision was debated, and Condemn'd in the first famous Council at *Jerusalem Act.* 15. 5. 10. 28, 29. In both these places methinks Infant Baptism shou'd have been prohibited, if it had been such a sinful Practise as our Opposers represent it; especially when it was

Our Lord and his Apostles did not forbid it, when there were fair occasions offer'd as mat. 28 19. Act 15. 5. 10. 28. 29.

a

a known and received Custom among the Jews to Baptize their own and proselites Children, long before that time, as is clearly proved by several Learned men of our Communion, and particularly by Bishop *Taylor* (of whom these men so often boast as if he favour'd their cause) tho' indeed they *only Flourish with his Objections, and take no Notice of the solid Answers himself returnes to them*; now this being so, to overthrow this Custom which they make as dangerous at least as Circumcision, or the Pollutions of Idols, the Apostles ought to have added this Clause to their *Jerusalem* Decree, that the Converted Jews and Gentiles must abstain from Infant-Baptism, as well as Meats offer'd to Idols; and our Lord, when he bid them Baptize all Nations, ought to have excepted Infants; because, such an Exception in the one, and Prohibition in the other, was necessary to destroy this Practice, if it was such an Evil and Corrupt one; and their silence in this matter, and in these two places, which were so proper for it, not forbidding the Jews to Baptize their Children as they had been accustomed to do, is to me a good Reason they never designed to exclude them from Baptism.

P. But to your first Reason they will make some Exceptions, as,

Their first Exception to this Reason answered.

1. That this Contradicts your former Rule, That in the Substantial part of Divine Worship there must be some direct or consequential Command in Scripture, or else we may not perform it.

Infant Baptism won'd have been forbidden if it is such an horrid Sin.

M. That I have already produced; but supposing there were no such Command, and that Infant-Baptism was such an horrid Profanation of this Ordinance, we cannot imagine but it would have been forbidden somewhere, and probably in *these two places*; and it being not forbidden there, nor any where else, it can be no hurt at least, if there is no good in it.

* *Mr. Kin Gold Ref. pag.* 114.

P. But this does not prove it our Duty, unless it is Commanded.

This as good reason for it as the not Commanding the Jewish Sabbath in the new Testament, is for the Observation of the Lords-day.

M. It proves it as much as the Reason they bring to prove we must keep the Lord's Day; *because*, (say they) * *God has not injoyned the Jewish Sabbath under the Gospel*; Now, What is this to the giving a Command for keeping the Lords Day? Is the not Commanding another Day of the Week the Commanding

manding the Lord's Day? What is that, but in other Words to ſay, That the not forbidding the Lord's Day is a Commanding it? And by the ſame Argument, the not-forbidden Infant-Baptiſm is the Commanding it; the Scriptures ſilence therein being as good a Reaſon for it, as its ſilence about the Jewiſh Sabbath is for the Obſervation of the Lord's Day.

* *Mr. K. R.R. p. 22.*

P. But they except ſecondly; * That no Man in his right Wits can think, That our Lord *Jeſus* ſhould confirm a vile Tradition and Innovation of the *Jews*, and take his great Ordinance of Baptiſm from the Superſtitious Fabulous and Erronious Cuſtom of their Doctors and Rabbins.

Their ſecond Exception anſwered.

The Paſchal Cup an uncommanded Jewiſh Cuſtom as much as Baptiſm.

M. But why might not our Lord *Jeſus* Conſecrate this *Jewiſh Cuſtom* into *Chriſtian Baptiſm*, as well as the *Paſchal Cup*, (another Jewiſh Cuſtom, and as much *Uncommanded* as the former) into an *Eſſential part* of the *Lord's Supper?* The one is as Rational and Warrantable as the other; and therefore a Man may be in his right Wits that believes both; and 'tis rather an Argument of a Crackt Brain not to believe either.

* *Sir* Norton Knatchbull *quoted by* Mr. K. *in R.R. p. 24.*

P. But they except thirdly; againſt this Cuſtom of the *Jews* to Baptize their Infant-Proſelites, and bring * one of our Communion to Confute it.

Does not Confute but Confirm the Cuſtom among the Jews of Infant-Baptiſm.

M. I have read the paſſage as 'tis quoted, (tho' I have not the Book it ſelf to Conſult the truth and fairneſs of the Quotation) yet as that Author is quoted, there is nothing in his Argument by which he wou'd Invalidate this Cuſtom: For all that he ſays, is, That Rabbi *Joſhua* was the firſt that aſſerted it, and Rabbi *Eliezer* contradicted him in it; but how did he contradict him? He did not deny the Cuſtom, but wou'd not have ſo much ſtreſs laid upon it, as if no one cou'd be a true Jewiſh Proſelite that was not Baptiz'd as well as Circumcis'd; the one ſaid, That *Baptiſm* without Circumciſion made a *True* Proſelyte; the other, That *Circumſion* without *Baptiſm* made a *True Proſelyte*; but this, inſtead of over-throwing, does confirm the Cuſtom; that the Baptiſm of Infant-Proſelytes was in uſe among the *Jews*, ſince this very thing was the occaſion of the Diſpute between them.

P. But *Joſephus*, who was a Jew, (he ſays) makes no mention of it.

M. It

M. It may be so; what then, as good Historians (as he) do mention it; particularly * *Maimonides*, who tells us, *By Three Things* Israel *entred into Covenant, by Circumcision, by Baptism, and Offering; and that they Baptize the Infant, or little Stranger, upon the Knowledge and Appointment of the House of Judgment or the Congregation:* In another of their most Authentick Writings 'tis Recorded, That *when any Heathens became Jews, not only the Proselytes themselves, but also their Infant-Children (if they had any) were Baptiz'd*; and to Counterballance the Authority of this Man of our Communion, I shall produce a great Man of their Communion, one of the greatest Champions for their bad Cause, I mean Mr. *Tombs*, who positively affirms, *That Baptism was a constant concomitant of Circumcision, if not Antienter, and that it was in use for many years together with Circumcision, tho' not a Sacrament*; and for this he Quotes the Learned Mr. *Selden*, *Ainsworth* on *Gen.* 17. and Mr. *Lightfoot*. Sir, What do you think now of Sir *Norton Knatchbull*'s Demonstration (for that is the Authors Name) against the Jewish Custom of Baptizing their own and Heathens Children when they were admitted into their Church? Is not all this rather a Demonstration for it?

* *Tit. Isuribiah, c.* 13

Gemara Babilonica.

Mr Tombs *says, Baptism was a constant concomitant of Circumcision, if not antienter, and that it was in use for many years together with Circumcision, tho' not a Sacrament.*

P. But the same Author adds; If Baptism in the Modern Sense were in use among the Jews in the Antient Times, why did the Pharisees ask *John Baptist*, Why dost thou Baptize if thou art not Christ, nor *Elias*, nor that Prophet? Do they not plainly intimate, that Baptism was not in Use before? And that it was a receiv'd Opinion among them, there shou'd be no Baptism, till either Christ, or *Elias*, or that Prophet came.

M. No such matter; The true Reason of the Pharisees Question to *John*, was this, That perceiving *John* to receive such a multitude of Jews into Discipleship, by Baptism, who were thereupon call'd *John*'s Disciples, they demanded of him, Why he took upon him to do so? To set up for a Reformer, and draw Disciples after him, solemnly initiating them into his Doctrine by Baptismal Washing? If he were not Christ, nor *Elias*, nor that Prophet, into whom alone they ought to be Baptiz'd, as they had been of old Baptiz'd into *Moses*; and *John*'s Answer shews this to be the Question, *ver.* 26, *&c.* 33. I Baptize with Water, who am but a Minister of the *Messias*, but he himself who is at hand, shall Baptize with the Holy Ghost;

The Pharisees did not question John for Baptizing with Water, but for Baptizing Disciples in his own or Christ's Name, if he were not the Messias.

Ghoſt; *i. e.* I do not receive ſuch Numbers of Proſelytes on my own Head, but have a Commiſſion for what I do, and by my Baptiſm prepare People for the Baptiſm of Chriſt, wherein the Holy Ghoſt will be pour'd forth upon them, and by my Baptiſm and Doctrine of Repentance, I do but make way for the more eaſie Reception of the Goſpel, and the Doctrine and Sacraments thereof.

P. But ſome ſay *John*'s Baptiſm and Chriſt's were all one.

M. If it were ſo, (which I don't believe) this affords alſo a good Reaſon for this Queſtion of the Phariſees; they might well ask *John*, Why he Baptiz'd in Chriſt's Name, and with Chriſt's Baptiſm, if he were not that Chriſt? which they thought great Preſumption in him to do; they did not demand of him, What he meant by Baptizing? No, They knew that Rite well enough, and therefore readily ſubmitted to it; but why Baptizeſt Thou as Chriſt, or *Elias*, or that Prophet, if thou art neither of them? as indeed he was one of them, even the *Elias* that was for to come, *Mat.* 11. 14.

P. I am ſatisfied there is nothing in this Knight's human Authority, nor his pretended Proof from Scripture, and that what Mr. *Tombs* affirms from the moſt Learned Jews and Chriſtians is undoubtedly true; That *Baptiſm was a concomitant of Circumciſion, (and then they muſt Baptize their Infants, who were Circumciſed at eight days old) and that it was in uſe among the Jews for many years together with Circumſion, though not a Sacrament*;

* *Mr.* K. *Gold. R f pag.* 152.

But Thirdly, they except againſt this Cuſtom, * that if it was practiced among the Jews, it is now Abrogated with all the other Jewiſh Ceremonies, which ſtood, (as the Apoſtle ſhews, *Heb.* 9. 10.) in Meats and Drinks, and divers Waſhings, and Carnal Ordinances, impoſed till the time of Reformation.

Their third exception from Heb. 9. 10. *anſwer'd. This texts forbids Jewiſh waſhings and not Chriſtian Baptiſm.*

M. This Text (if it be taken in the Senſe the Oppoſers urge it) only Condemns *Jewiſh Baptiſms* or *Waſhings*, which conſisted in *putting away the filth of the Fleſh*, and *cleanſing them from legal Pollutions*; 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. but it does not Condemn *Chriſtian Waſhings or Baptiſms.* which takes *away the filth of the Spirit*, and are the Inſtrumental Means God has Ordain'd to make the Baptized Perſons to become new Creatures; tho' 'tis not the Water, but the Holy Spirit of God that moves upon the face

face of theſe Waters which produceth this newneſs of life; as 'tis not the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper, but the Holy Spirit which accompanies the worthy Partaking thereof that Preſerves and Cheriſhes it.

P. But here they Demand, Where God has oblig'd himſelf by any Promiſe to apply his Spirit to the Soul in a Gracious Operation, when the Baptiſmal Water is applied to the Body?

M. The ſame Demand might be as well made in Reference to the Lord's Supper, Where is there any Promiſe of the Holy Spirit in the due participation thereof? And the Anſwer is the ſame to both; That where Almighty God has injoyn'd theſe Ordinances, there is ſuch a promiſe either expreſs'd, or implyed, of his conveying Grace in the due Celebration of them; and the Promiſe that is annex'd to Baptiſm is to be found in ſeveral places of Scripture; I ſhall name but Three; *Act.* 22. 16. Where *Ananias* adviſes St. *Paul* in order to his thorough Converſion, to ariſe and be Baptiz'd, and waſh away his Sins, *&c.* Which implys that Almighty God do's derive pardoning and Regenerating Grace to us by Baptiſm; and *Joh.* 3. 5. 5. Except one be born of Water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God; where our Lord expreſſes Chriſtian Baptiſm by the two principal Parts, the Spirit and the Water, of which this Sacrament conſiſts; and likewiſe implys that both together are the means which he has ordain'd to work our Converſion and procure our Admiſſion into his Kingdom of Grace and Glory; and *Tit.* 3. 5. *l. pt.* According to his Mercy he ſaved us by the Waſhing of Regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghoſt; by which phraſes the Apoſtle means Chriſtian Baptiſm, St. *Paul* putting the two Chief parts Waſhing and renewing for the whole of it, and ſays both together accompliſh Salvation, if we our ſelves by our own willful Sins do not hinder it; now is not the *Scripture's mentioning the Spirit to concur with the Water in Baptiſm tantamount to a Promiſe, that in the due uſe thereof the Holy Spirit ſhall concur with it*? I am ſure they cannot produce the like proofs for the Promiſe of the Spirit in the Lords Supper, which yet I preſume they as well as we, grant to be a nouriſhing and ſtrengthning ordinance; and theſe three Texts prove

Chriſtian Baptiſm prov'd to be a regenerating and ſaving ordinance from Act. 22. 16. Joh. 3. 5. and Tit. 3.

that Baptiſm is more than a meer initiating ſign to the Baptized partys (which is all that ſome of our Oppoſers will allow it) even that 'tis a *Seal too of the Pardan of their Sins, and the only ordinary means God has appointed for their Converſion and Salvation.*

P. I am glad you have ſo well prov'd this point, about which ſome Diſſenters are unſatisfied, and have therefore quarrel'd at our Church, for ſaying Children are *Regenerated in Baptiſm*; I find the Holy Scriptures ſay the *ſame thing*; and therefore no Chriſtian has reaſon to be offended at it; but have you any thing more to offer in anſwer to this Exception from *Heb.* 9. 10?

As these men expound Heb. 9. 10. they deſtroy their own way of Baptiſm by dipping which was alſo practiced among the Jews.

M. Yes I have, and 'tis this; That if this Text be a Univerſal prohibition of all kinds of Religious Waſhings (as theſe men ſeem to expound it) then is their Dipping of grown Perſons as unlawful as our ſprinkling of Infants in Baptiſm; becauſe all ſuch Waſhings under the Law, were to ceaſe in the eſtabliſhment of the Goſpel; and then farewel Water-Baptiſm; but the truth is as our Saviour adopted the Paſchal Cup (which was a Jewiſh rite, and an addition to the Paſſover) into an eſſential part of the Lord's Supper; ſo he Conſecrated this Jewiſh waſhing of their Infants, into Chriſtian Baptiſm; and then I may well infer that ſince Chriſt did not except Infants out of his Commiſſion to Baptize all Nations, nor his Apoſtles after him forbid it, they both intended and implyed thereby that Infants ſhou'd be Baptiz'd in the Chriſtian Church.

P. Sir the reaſon is good, and pray let me hear another.

The ſecond Reaſon for it; that the Jews no where complain of their being abridged of Infant Church-membership and yet complain'd of leſſer matters.

M. Becauſe the Jews no where complain of the abolition of this Antient cuſtom and Priviledge to recieve Infants into their Church; which 'tis likely they wou'd, if our Lord had certainly debar'd them of it; for how fond were they of their Antient cuſtoms and Traditions, not only Preferring them before the Commandments of God, but alſo being ready to Kill any man that went about to infring them or take them away! Their cry againſt St. *Stephen*, and for which they ſtoned him to Death, was for ſaying that *Jeſus of Nazareth ſhall Change the Cuſtoms which* Moſes *delivered them.* Act. 6. 14. And their *Cry* againſt St *Paul*, and for which they had like to have torn him in pieces, was for his ſuppos'd *Profanation* of the

Temple

Temple, Act. 21. 28. And wou'd not they have rais'd a greater *out-cry* againſt our Lord and his Apoſtles, than *Men of Iſrael help*, if with Infant Circumciſion they had likewiſe aboliſh'd *Infant Church-Member-ſhip*? now ſince there are no ſuch complaints or outcrys for their being depriv'd of this Ancient cuſtom to be found in the whole New Teſtament, I may fairly conclude there was no cauſe given them for it, and conſequently that Infant Baptiſm and Church-member-ſhip was ſtill to be allow'd them.

P. But to this they may except by ſaying the converted Jews might know it was the will of Chriſt to have it ſo, and that might ſatisfie them and make them ſilent.

M. 'Tis plain they were not ſilent in leſſer matters (as I have ſhewn) and therefore why did there never ariſe any diſpute about *this* as there did about Circumciſion?

P. But* they except further by ſaying, That if becauſe the Jews practiſed Infant-Baptiſm we Chriſtians muſt do the like; then on the ſame account becauſe their Children did Eat the Paſſover, ours muſt be admitted to the Lord's Supper, which ſeems very abſur'd. *Mr. K. in G. R. pag. 151, 152.*

M. There were ſome force in this exception (tho' it be nothing to the purpoſe) if the Jewiſh Infants had been certainly admitted to the Paſſover as ſoon as they were to Baptiſm; or if the command had been as *univerſal* for the one as for the other ordinance, that *all Nations* ſhou'd *Eat* of that *Bread* and *Drink* of that Cup; or if when there was a fair opportunity for Excluding Children from the Lord's Supper they had not been excluded from it; but if none of theſe things fall out to make the Caſes parallel, the exception is of little value; for the beſt Expoſitors agree, That the Jews Children were not to partake of the Paſſover till they came to ſome years of Knowledge, and underſtood the meaning of the Service they then perform'd unto Almighty God; and for this they quote *Exod.* 12. 26, 27. and it ſhall come to paſs, *when your Children* ſhall ſay unto you what *mean you by* this Service? That ye ſhall ſay it is the Sacrifice of the Lord's Paſſover, who paſs'd over the houſes of the Children of *Iſrael* in *Ægypt*, when he ſmote the Ægyptians and deliver'd our houſes, and the People bowed the Head and Worſhipped; but the Jews Children were wont

Their firſt main exception Anſwer'd the caſe not parallel for our Children to receive the Lord's Supper, as for the Jews Children to eat the Paſſover, neither did they eat of it, till they knew the meaning of That Service Exod. 12. 26. 27.

to recieve Baptiſm as early as they did Circumciſion, which was at eight days old, or at fartheſt as ſoon as they were whole of that painful rite. But 2*ly*. If this text do's not prove that the Jews Children muſt underſtand the Paſſover before they partook of it, have theſe men any better proof that they partook of it at all? eſpecially ſince when they did, they were to Eat it ſtanding with a ſtaff in their Hand, which Infants cou'd not do.

P. They urge *Exod.* 12. 3, 4. that the Jews were to take a Lamb according to the number of the Souls, a Lamb for an Houſe; whence they think it plain that the Children were to Eat of it.

There is as plain a proof in Mat 28. 19. *for Baptizing Chriſtians Children as in Exod* 12. 3. 4. *for the Jews children eating the paſſover. And as good reaſon to reſtrain the latter as the former Text to grown perſons.*

M. Well, ſuppoſe Chriſt had ſaid *Let Baptiſm be adminſtred in all Diſcipled Nations, according to the number of Souls that are in the Houſe*; wou'd this have been a ſufficient Warrant for Infant Baptiſm?

P. No doubt but they muſt allow it.

M. Very well, what is the difference between ſuch a Command and that of our Saviours? Go, Diſciple all Nations Baptizing them; *Mat.* 28. 19. are not *Children* included under *Diſcipled Nations* as much as they are under the Phraſes [*of a Lamb for an Houſe, and according to the number of the Souls*?] And when we read of ſeveral *whole Houſhoulds* that were Baptiz'd, do's not this as fully prove, That the Children of Chriſtian Parents are to recieve Baptiſm, as that the Children of the Jewiſh Parents were to Eat of the Paſſover?

P. But you know our Antagoniſts ſay here, That this Precept of Chriſt, is to be limited to grown Believers and not to be extended to Children.

M. I know they do; but is there not as much reaſon that this Command of *Moſes* ſhou'd be alſo thus reſtrain'd? For is it not expreſsly ſaid *Exod.* 12. 3. They ſhall take to them every *man* a Lamb; and *ver.* 4. and every *Man* according to his eating; here is no mention of *Children*, or ſo much as of *Women* that were to Eat of it; and then this phraſe according to the number of the Souls, muſt be underſtood of *ſuch Perſons* as were *Men*; and why may not ſuch an interpretation of this Precept about the Paſſover, be as good as theirs of the precept about Baptiſm? and if it is; then neither Women

nor

nor Children did Eat of the Paſſover, there being no expreſs Command for their ſo doing; and then what is become of the Abſurdity they wou'd draw from the Jewiſh Children's Eating the Paſſover, that our Children muſt partake of the Lord's Supper?

P. This really pinches them; and ſhews theſe Men's partiality; they readily grant that the Jewiſh Women and Children Eat the Paſſover, but will not grant that our Children may recieve Baptiſm, tho' there is as plain a Command for the one as for the other.

M. And to give you another Inſtance of their partiality, the Perſon (whom we have had Occaſion often to mention) calls Biſhop *Taylor* * *the worthy Doctor*, when he *unhappily* frames a *better Anſwer* for their Party than they cou'd have invented themſelves? but when that worthy Doctor forms *an Objection* againſt them, from the known Cuſtom of the Jews to Baptize their Infant Children; what * *he ſays upon this account* (tho' never ſo true) *is to his Shame and Reproach rather than to his Honour.*

* *M.* K. R. R. *pag.* 11.

* *Idem pag.* 22d.

P. But they further urge that Repentance and Faith is requir'd of them that are to be Baptiz'd, even Actual Faith and Repentance, as well as Actual Grace and examination *&c.* to diſcern the Lord's Body in thoſe who are to recieve the Lord's Supper.

M. To (this alſo tho' it no way Invalidates my Second reaſon) I have ſeveral things to return in Anſwer; as

Their Second main exception anſwer'd.

Actual faith and repentance requir'd by our Church of grown perſons only before Baptiſm and not of Children.

1*ſt.* When our Church ſays that Repentance and Faith is requir'd of Perſons to be Baptiz'd, 'tis plain ſhe reſtrains this to *grown People* who are to make a *Perſonal* profeſſion thereof in order to their Recieving Baptiſm; but for Infants who cannot make it, ſuch a Profeſſion of their *Suretys* in their behalf ſhall be *Sufficient* to Baptize them.

2*ly.* If Infants have Faith and Repentance in *the Seed* (as I ſhall God willing prove by and by) This is enough to qualify them for Baptiſm, becauſe they have theſe graces in truth; but they muſt have Faith and Repentance in the *Fruit i. e.* they muſt have theſe graces in their *growth*, before they can be qualified for the Lord's Table; they muſt be *Men* and able to *examine* themſelves and *diſcern* the Lord's Body e're they may partake of it;

More requir'd to come to the Lord's Supper than to

3*ly.* Un-

Baptism; Faith in the seed sufficient for the one, Faith in the Fruit needful for the other. 'Tis enough for our Children to have Faith and repentance initially and this was required of the Jews Children and promised them at their Circumcision even to circumcise their hearts Deut. 10. 15. 16. chap. 30. 6.

3*ly*. Under the Law those that were *Circumcis'd* were in Effect requir'd to *Repent* and *Believe*; for they were requir'd to Circumcise their Hearts, which implies as much; *Deut*. 10. 15. 16. only the Lord had a delight in thy Fathers to Love them, and he chose their seed after them even you above all People as it is this day; *Circumcise* therefore the *Foreskin* of your Heart, and be no more *Stiffnecked*; and *Deut*. 30. 6. The Lord God will Curcumcise thine Heart, and the Heart of thy Seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thy Heart, and with all thy Soul, *&c*. And if the Jews seed, *i. e*. their Children's Hearts were Curcumcised by the Lord, what do's this import, but that they did *Initially* at least repent and believe? and then, why are not our Children capable of doing this as well as theirs?

4*ly*. These men will allow *Saints in Appearance* may receive Baptism, and then *Children* may also receive it, whom in Charity we ought to think as well of, as of grown Persons; but I presume they will allow none to come to the Lord's Table, but *Saints in reality*, a *Professing Disciple* may be Baptiz'd, but none but a *True Disciple* may Communicate, as may be gather'd from their Books.

They Baptize Profes'd Disciples but communicate none but True Disciples. Mr. K. R R. pag. 35.

5*ly*. They grant a *Regenerate Infant* (if we know who were such) may be *Baptiz'd*; but I suppose they will not say, *That such a Regenerate Child ought to be immediately admitted to the Lord's Supper*; but that he ought at least to ratify his Baptismal Covenant by Confirmation, before he can be capable of the other Sacrament; that being a rite to which adult Baptiz'd Disciples did antiently submit, before they durst Communicate, which makes another difference in the case, and proves that all that have a right to the one, have not on that account an immediate right to the other Ordinance.

They allow a regenerate Child may be Baptiz'd; but I suppose will not for some to give him th Lords Supper. Act. 2. 39 and chapt. 10.

6*ly*. Whether our Antagonists will grant that regenerate Children may be Baptiz'd or no? The holy Scriptures grant as much; *Act*. 10. 47. Can any man forbid water, that these should not be Baptiz'd, who have receiv'd the Holy Ghost as well as we? *Here is a sufficient warrent to Baptize all regenerate Infants, but where is there the like warrant for giving them the Lord's Supper*? 'Tis not said, Can any forbid *Bread and Wine*; that these should not receive the Lord's supper as well as we? but on the contrary, 'tis said, let a *Man* examin himself, not

Children,

Children, who are not able to do it; 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. by which text Children are excluded from the Lord's ſupper; but they are not excluded from Baptiſm, by any one Text in the New Teſtament about it; let them but produce ſuch a Text which forbids Infants to be Baptiz'd, and we ſhall quietly give up the cauſe.

47. *will warrant the one; but* 1. *cor.* 11. 28. *do's condemn the other.*

P. Really Sir, you have clear'd this point, and ſhew'd the caſes to be widely different between Infant Baptiſm, and Infant Communion; and I preſume when our Hectoring Author ſhall hear this, we ſhall hear no more of his proud Challenges; * *We Challenge all the World (which is Written in a different Character, that all the World may take notice of it) by God's Word, to prove they (Infants) are capable of Baptiſm, any more than of the Lord's ſupper*; I am ſure you have prov'd from *Act.* 10. 47. That ſuch Infants as have the Holy Ghoſt (and for ought we know all believers Children may have it) are capable of the one, and from 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. That they are not capable of the other ordinance; but pray Sir what is your Third reaſon?

* *Mr.* Keach. *Reſt. Reſt.* pag. 146.

M. Becauſe if the Jews Children had been excluded from Baptiſm, it muſt needs have been a mighty hinderance to their Converſion, and one of the greateſt ſtumbling Blocks in their way to Chriſtianity that cou'd have been laid before them; Why *ſhou'd they forſake the Law and imbrace the Goſpel, which wou'd put their Children into a worſe condition than they were before? before they received the Seal of the Covenant, which was Circumciſion, and ſo were reckon'd in the number of God's People, but now they muſt be denied the Seal of the ſame Covenant, which is Baptiſm, and ſo there Children were not to be accounted among the People of God, nor in any better condition as to Church priviledges than Heathens and Idolaters*; which had the Jews believ'd (as they muſt if the Baptiſm of Infants had been forbidden) it was enough to have kept their whole Nation from imbracing the Chriſtian Faith.

The Third reaſon for Infant Baptiſm; that the abolition of it would have been a mighty hinderance to the Jews converſion by putting their Children into a worſe ſtate than they were before.

P. But to This reaſon alſo they make ſome exceptions, as

1. That Circumciſion was no Covenant of Grace or Faith, and our Author muſters up no leſs than Ten Arguments (ſuch as they are) to prove it; his * firſt is That the Covenant of Circumciſion, was made to ſeperate the Natural Seed of *Abraham* from all the Nations of the World, and it made ſure to them the promiſe of the Poſſeſſion of the Land of *Canaan*; therefore it cou'd not be a Covenant of Grace or Faith.

* *Mr.* K. R. R. pag 47.

P. Sir,

Their first Exception to this reason answered.

M. Sir, 'Tis an *ill Omen* to *ſtumble in the Threſhold*, and there is little Dependance upon this Man's Ten Arguments, when his firſt conſiſts of notorious Untruths; For the *Proſelyted Strangers* of other Nations were alſo *Circumciſed*; and how then did Circumciſion ſeparate the Natural Seed of *Abraham* from all Nations of the World? How *was the Natural Jew diſtinguiſh'd from the Proſelyted Gentile by Circumciſion, when both equally had it?* By *That* therefore, if there was nothing elſe, you could not know them from one another; neither was Circumciſion a Seal of the Poſſeſſion of *Canaan*, becauſe the Proſelyted Strangers of other Nations, who were likewiſe Circumciſed, had no part nor Portion in that Promis'd Land; which they wou'd have had, if this had been the end of Circumciſion; for *why ſhou'd not all that had this Seal, have the Temporal Bleſſings that were Seal'd by it? Circumciſion therefore was Ordain'd of God, for higher and nobler Ends than theſe, even to Seal Spiritual Mercies in Chriſt Jeſus, and the poſſeſſion of the Heavenly Canaan, of which the Earthly was but a Type and Shaddow*; and ſo much St. *Paul* teſtifies, *Rom.* 4. 11. where he ſtyles Circumciſion, a Seal of the Righteouſneſs of the Faith, which *Abraham* had, yet being Uncircumciſed.

Circumciſion no peculiar Rite to the Seed of Abraham, nor a Seal to them only of the Promiſed Land being given to the Proſelyted Strangers of all Nations who had no Inheritance in Canaan.

P. But here they pretend that Circumciſion was a Seal of *Abraham*'s Faith only, and a Seal of Faith to none beſides.

M. Sir, They may pretend what they will, but *who can or will believe what they ſay?* That Almighty God ſhould Inſtitute Circumciſion for a *whole Nation* *, and for *Strangers* and *Foreigners too*, that ſhould be Proſelyted to the Jewiſh Religion, and yet Ordain, that Circumciſion ſhou'd be a *Seal of the Faith but of one man among ſo many Millions?* This ſeems incredible: Certainly, If other Jews and Gentiles had the ſame Faith that *Abraham* had, and were Circumcis'd as he was, we have all the reaſon in the World to believe, That Circumciſion was a *Seal of the Righteouſneſs of Faith to them alſo*; becauſe they had that *Faith* which *Abraham* had, and conſequently their Circumciſion was a Seal of it; being called by the Apoſtle, A *Seal of the Righteouſneſs of the Faith which Abraham had*, Rom. 4. 11.

Circumciſion a Seal of Faith, not only to Abraham and his Poſterity, but alſo to all other People that imbraced the Jewiſh Religion.

P. But

P. But they make a ſecond Exception, by ſaying; There was an Old Law, wherein Infants were admitted to be Members of the National Church of the Jews, but that Law was to continue but till Chriſt came; as it came in with the Law of Circumciſion, ſo it went out and was diſannulled with it.

Their ſecond Exception anſwered.

M. Let them prove this, and ſhew the Law which confines Infants Church-Memberſhip to the Jewiſh, and excludes it from the Chriſtian Church, and that this Church Priviledge of Believers Children was to ceaſe when Chriſt came, (who yet Died for them as well as others) let them prove this, (I ſay) and the Diſpute is over, and we ſhall yield the Cauſe; but till they produce this Law which diſannuls Infants Church-Memberſhip, we think we have good Grounds ſtill to Baptize them; Theſe Men grant there was a Law for it; and unleſs they can ſhew a Law againſt it, we have no reaſon to be frighted out of this Chriſtian Practice. For inſtance, *Suppoſe there were an Act of Parliament, wherein ſuch Priviledges are granted to all Engliſh Subjects and their Children, without any Limitation of time for their Continuance; and afterwards there comes another new Act of Parliament, wherein more and greater Priviledges are granted to all Engliſh Subjects, without any mention of the former, or of their Children; thoſe former Priviledges are held by all Lawyers to belong ſtill to all Engliſh Subjects and their Children, becauſe all ſuch Acts and Beneficial Clauſes thereof are ſtill in Force till they are Repeal'd by the ſame Power that made them.*

Infants Church-memberſhip onceenacted by an old Law, therefore ſtill in force, being not repeal'd by a new.

P. But they ſay further, That Infant Church-Memberſhip was a Legacy Bequeathed to the Jewiſh Church by Chriſt's old and former Will and Teſtament; but now by another Will his Laſt will and Teſtament, this Legacy is not Bequeath'd to Infants.

M. This Man is mighty *fond* of *this* and his *former Similitude*, repeating them ſeveral times in his Books, as if they did amount to a Demonſtration; but alas! there is nothing of a probable Argument in them: I have already ſhewn the faultineſs of the former, and ſhall now ſhew that this Compariſon is alſo faulty, and will not prove the Point for which it is produced; and my Reaſon is, Becauſe the Law and the

Infants Church-membership a Legacy in Christ's Will the old Testament, and not disanull'd in the Codicill annext to it, which is the New Testament; therefore what God has given and bequeathed, let not man take away.

Gospel, though they differ in some Circumstances, yet are not *two Wills* of *Christ*, but for *Substance, one and the same Will and Testament*, even the same Covenant of Faith in our Lord Jesus; or rather, *the Gospel in respect of the Law is like a Codicill to a Will, the adding some further Legacies that were not given before; and no Legacies that were Bequeathed in the foregoing Will can be cut off, unless it be particularly express'd in the Codicill annex'd to it; with an Item, What I gave to such a one and his Children, my Will now is, shall not be given them, and I do hereby Revoke my former Grant and Bequest:* In like manner, Infant Church-Membership must remain in force under the Gospel as it has done under the Law, unless it be the Will of Christ it shou'd cease; and he had declar'd as much in the Codicill of the New Testament; but no such thing appearing there, this *Authors Comparison turns upon him*, and proves that Infant Church-Membership is still in force.

P. So it does; And no doubt you have other Reasons to confirm it.

The fourth Reason for it, that God must have fail'd in his Promise to the Church, and had no Church in the World for above 1600 years, if Infant-Baptism be an Unchurching Error as these men hold.

M. My fourth is, Because our Lord has promised to be with his Church to the end of the World, to Guide her into all necessary Truth, *Matth.* 28. 20. *Joh.* 16. 13. which he has not perform'd to her if Infant-Baptism be such a *Fundamental Error* as to render all those *Mock-Churches* wherein 'tis practised, as some of our Opposers in this Point *Uncharitably* affirm in their Writings, and all of them imply in their Actions, by *Rebaptizing* all their Proselytes; which is a clear Indication of their Mind, that they Esteem all others besides themselves no Christians; and then there was no Visible Church upon the Face of the Earth for above Sixteen hundred years; because there was no Visible Church all that while, wherein Infant-Baptism was not practised; and dare any so far impeach God's Veracity, as to say, he did *so long forsake his Church? So long suffer the gates of Hell to prevail against it?*

Their first Exception to this in * *Mr. Blackwood's Storming of Antichrist pag.* 26, 28, 29, 55.

P. But to this Reason also they make some Exceptions.

1st. They say, That though Infant Baptism was in the Church about Three hundred years after Christ, yet before that time there was no such thing; and to that purpose * one of them Quotes some of the Antient Fathers, who, (he says) were so far

far from countenancing this Practice, that they were againſt it, and for Baptizing none but thoſe that cou'd give an account of their Faith.

M. But this pretence is ſufficiently Confuted by Mr. *Walker*, who proves, That the Fathers who lived the Firſt Three Hundred years in their Genuine Works, either expreſsly mention'd, or by good conſequence aſſerted Infant-Baptiſm, and he anſwers all their Cavils and Exceptions againſt thoſe Antient Father's Authority; but this being an Argument above the common People's reach, I ſhall ſay no more of it, but refer you, and ſuch Gentlemen as are more curious, to * the Book it ſelf for Satisfaction; only this by the way; That if we ſhou'd grant this to be true, that Infant-Baptiſm came into the Church Three hundred years after Chriſt; yet, from that time downwards, for more than Twelve hundred years has it been practiced in it; and all that while at leaſt, if it be ſuch an Unchurching Error, (as 'tis pretended) the Church of God muſt have fail'd, which is contrary to his unchangeable Truth and Promiſes, *Matth.* 28. 20. *Joh.* 16. 13.

is fully anſwered in

*Walker's *Modeſt Plea for Infant-Baptiſm, p. 278, 281 282, 283 284.*

P. But to this they ſay, ſecondly, That all Churches have Erred for many hundred years, as in admitting Children to the Lord's Supper, *&c.*

M. In Anſwer to this we Grant, That all Churches may Err in *ſmaller matters*, but not in *fundamental Points*, as they pretend Infant-Baptiſm is; But as for Infant-Communion, tho' it was an Error, 'twas no Fundamental One; if it did no good, it did no harm to Dying Children, nor make it ceaſe to be a Church, wherein it was Adminiſtred; moreover, it proceeded from a well-meant, tho' a miſguided Zeal to do every thing, and omit nothing that might conduce to their Children's Salvation, and had a probable Text of Scripture to Countenance it: *Joh.* 6. 53. *Except ye eat the fleſh of the ſon of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you*; which many of the Antients underſtood of the Lord's Supper, and the neceſſity thereof for all, in order to their being ſaved; but when they perceiv'd this Text was miſ-interpreted, and miſ-applied to Infants, who were not capable of doing this in Remembrance of Chriſt, and Diſcerning the Lord's Body, (if it had any reference at all to it) this practice was look'd on as Erroneous and

Their ſecond Exception anſwered.

Infant-Communion no Fundamental Error.

The Church may Err ſuperſtructively, but not fundamentally

lain aside; but so was not Infant-Baptism, which was in the Church long before, even in the Apostle's days, and has likewise ever since that time continued in it.

Their third Exception in

P. But thirdly, they say, The Church of God is Invisible, and such an Invisible Church there might be amidst Antichristian Corruptions, (of which they are pleas'd to reckon Infant-Baptism one.)

M. I confess the *Invisibility* of the Church is the *Parent of most of the dangerous Errors*, which these Men hold; this will justifie them all, and a thousand more, tho' never so repugnant to the Practice of the Catholick visible Church, which they look on as a meer * Dream; but the same Author contradicts himself in the same Page, and says, That *One of the Three Things which are necessary to the being of a particular Church, is a right matter, which he makes * visible Saints*; and if visible Saints constitute particular Churches, the Church Catholick or Universal (which is but a Collection of particular Churches) must also consist of visible Saints; and where there are always such *visible Saints*, the *Church* must needs be always *Visible*; and so much the same * Man again acknowledges in the foregoing Page: His words, are these; *We desire to have a Church describ'd by such Notes as cannot be applied to any other Society in the World, the taking away one of which destroys the Essence of the Church; that so God's People may know how to recollect themselves by these Signs, as Captains in War use by Military Signs to recollect their routed and scatter'd Forces:* But whether these Men will own the Church to be visible or no, our Lord *Jesus* affirms it, calling his Disciples, (who were the Church Representative at that time) The *Light of the World*, a *City that is set on a Hill*, which *cannot be hid*, *Matth.* 5. 14. both which Expressions prove the Church of God to be visible, as *visible as the light of the Sun is to the World, or as a City on a high Hill is to a Traveller, which he may behold afar off, and know how to direct his way to it.*

Mr. Blackstor, Ant. Pref pag. 7. answered.

The holding the Church invisible, the mother of dangerous Errors, according to our Opposers, Ib. p. 6. it consists of visible Saints, therefore cannot be wholly Invisible;

The Church of God visible in all Ages, therefore called the Light of the World a City on a Hill, Matt. 5. 14.

P. Sir, You have oblig'd me in Confuting these Men's Errors from Scripture, as well as their own Mouths; But what is your Fifth Reason?

M. Be-

M. Becauſe there is no other ordinary way of our Childrens Salvation, and we can have no Comfortable Hopes, if they Die in Infancy, that their Souls are Safe in Heaven without it; as is plain, from *John* 3. 5. *Except one be born of Water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God*; and I wiſh, all Parents, eſpecially ſuch as think themſelves blameleſs, and their Children ſecure, (though they ſuffer them to Die Unbaptiz'd, when they had opportunities of Baptizing them) would ſeriouſly reflect on this Text, Except one be Born of Water, and the Spirit, *&c.* which does plainly imply, That unleſs *our Children receive Chriſtian Baptiſm, we cannot have a well grounded hopes of their entrance into the kingdom of God.*

The Fifth Reaſon for Infant Baptiſm, that 'tis the only ordinary means of our Children's Salvation.

P. If I had no other Reaſon to Baptize my Children, I believe this would prevail with me to do it, for fear leaſt otherwiſe I ſhould be acceſſary to their Eternal Ruin and Deſtruction; but yet here they except too, and ſay, Almighty God is *infinitely merciful, and has many ways to ſave Unbaptized Children which we know not of.*

M. Indeed, they are left to the *infinite Mercies of Almighty God*; and *'tis well they are ſo*; and that their *Heavenly Father* is like to prove more Merciful to them than their *own Earthly Parents have been*; But what Grounds have any for ſuch *Unbaptized Childrens* Salvation any more than they have for the Salvation of *Heathens?* ſince the Scripture declares as much againſt the one as the other, *Joh.* 3. 5. compar'd with *Act.* 4. 12. and if we have recourſe to extraordinary ways of ſaving Souls, we may conceive hopes of the Salvation of Heathens as well as Unbaptized Children; In like manner, the *Thief* on the *Croſs* was Saved by an *Extraordinary Mercy*, though he repented not till the laſt hour, and never receiv'd *Chriſtian Baptiſm* or the *Lord's Supper* at all; yet ſhould we not count that Man extream Preſumptuous, who wou'd defer his Repentance to the Hour of Death, and never partake of theſe two great Ordinances in all his life, becauſe there is *one inſtance* of the Thief on the Croſs that was Saved without them? and 'tis no leſs Preſumption on the account of God's extraordinary and uncovenanted Mercy to defer the Baptiſm of Children.

Their Exception to this Reaſon anſwered.

'Tis dangerous to neglect the ordinary and truſt to the extraordinary mercy of God; as thoſe Parents do who let their Children die without Baptiſm.

P. I am for providing for my Children the ordinary means of their Salvation, as I find Baptism certainly is, and will not leave them to God's extraordinary Mercy, which depends purely on his Sovereign Will, and he is under no Covenant to bestow; But here I have a fair opportunity to mention two Exceptions more, which some Men make to two former Passages in our first Conference; and therefore shall beg leave now to propose them.

M. With all my Heart, I shall endeavour to clear the Exceptions as well as I can.

P. The first is at that * Passage, where you say, [*the Pardon of Original Sin may be granted them, (i.e. Children) without admitting them to the joys of Heaven,*] which seems contrary to *Psal.* 32. 1, 2. and *Rom.* 4. 7, 8.

*An Exception to * Religious Conference, p. 14. answered, not contrary to Rom. 4. 7 8. because besides the Pardon of Original Sin, Infants must be sanctified before they can be Saved, Rom. 4, 6. Rev. 19. 6.*

M. But this is a *meer Cavill*, as you must acknowledge if you consider the Words immediately following the Excepted Passage, and are part of the same Sentence, [*which cannot be obtain'd without Christ's imputed or their own inherent Righteousness*] which implys, that Heaven may be, and is obtain'd by Children this way, which agrees exactly with St. *Paul's* Doctrine, *Rom.* 4. 6. That this Heavenly Blessedness cometh upon them, because God imputeth Righteousness to them without Works; which is somewhat more than the bare Pardoning the Original Sin of Children, and does necessarily imply a real or imputed Holiness to be also in them; and these are things of a distinct Nature from each other, (as a Rebels Pardon for his Life is from a Patent for a place at Court.)

P. But though a King may Pardon a Traytor, and not prefer him, (*and 'tis strange he shou'd*) yet our good God, whenever he Pardon's Children, or any other Person, he withall Sanctifies and Saves them.

M. I readily grant it; And if our Antagonists will grant that all Children are *Sanctified* before they are *Saved*, (as they must) or else contradict several places of Scripture, particularly, *Revel.* 19. 6. Blessed and Holy is he that hath part in the first Resurrection, on such the second Death hath no Power) than certainly such *Sanctified* Children

may

may be *Baptiz'd*; for can any forbid Water that these shou'd not be Baptiz'd who have receiv'd the Holy Ghost? *Act.* 10. 47.

P. But their Evasion to this is; That we do not know what Children are Sanctified and will be Saved, and for that reason ought not to Baptize any.

M. But at this rate of Arguing, we ought not to Baptize *any Man or Woman* in the World; because we do not really know, whither they are *certainly Sanctified* and will *be Saved?* They may be *Hypocrites*, and at last Damn'd for being such, notwithstanding their Profession of Christianity; and why then do they Administer to any the Ordinance of Baptism?

P. These Men will tell you, 'tis because they profess Faith *in Jesus Christ*, which is more than Children can do, and therefore they Baptize the one and not the other.

M. But where have they a Scripture command to Baptize such as profess Faith with the Mouth, when they have it not in the Heart? I am sure if Children have Faith in the heart (which is not impossible as I shall prove hereafter) they ought to be Baptiz'd, altho' they cannot profess it with their mouth; and we may be as certain of Children's as of Men's having true Faith, and consequently have as good grounds to Baptize the one as the other; and therefore I wonder these People Rebaptize Men and Women that were Baptiz'd in infancy for their supposed want of Faith in their former Baptism; and yet never Rebaptize Hypocrites upon their after Conversion for their real want of Faith, when Baptiz'd before in an unconverted Estate; and I desire a good reason from them of this partial and different proceeding; as I think what I have said is of that questioned passage of mine; for *pardoning grace* is *one thing* and *sanctifying grace another*; and tho' whosoever has the one, in due time has the other, yet are they distinct Acts in God the giver as well as in Man the receiver; and therefore Pardoning grace only without Sanctifying grace also cannot qualify Children for Heaven or entitle them to it; the contrary of which was in effect affirm'd by * one of our oppofers, (tho' he had no need to have done so, because he says That

We may be as certain of Children's as of grown persons having faith, and can only know either by the Judgment of Charity. They have as much reason to rebaptize hypocrites as Adult Proselytes for their supposed want of Faith in their former Baptism.

* *Mr. Blackstor Ant. page* 11. *says Original Sin dos not simply Damn.*

That *Original ſin do's not ſimply damn*, and then what need is there of pardoning it?) and I had all the reaſon in the World to deny; and I do once more aſſert it as an undoubted truth, that if dying Infants are only pardoned their Original Sin (which is all that this man ſuppoſes, and he contradicts himſelf in ſuppoſing it, ſince he ſays it do's not ſimply damn any) this indeed will keep them from Hell, but without *Sanctification* (of which he ſays not one word) they cannot be admitted into *Heaven*.

*Another exception to *Religious conference pag 25. anſwered.*

P. I am glad you have clear'd this paſſage at which ſome have ſtumbled tho' I now find there was no cauſe for any to be offended at it; but ſome are diſpleas'd at another * paſſage, where you ſay that Text of St. *Paul*, *Rom.* 9. 12. *Jacob* have I loved, but *Eſau* have I hated, is not to be underſtood of the eternal Election of the one or Reprobation of the other; which they pretend is contrary to the Apoſtles expreſs declaration, *ver.* 11. For the Children being not yet born, nor having done any good or evil; That the *purpoſe of God according* to *election* might ſtand; not of Works but of him that calleth; which implies (ſay they) the eternal decree of God concerning the Salvation of *Jacob* and Damnation of *Eſau*.

M. But I cannot think this to be St. *Paul*'s meaning.

Eſau's eternal reprobation cannot be proved from Rom 9 11.

1*ſt*. Becauſe tho' there be mention made of *Election*, there is none of *Reprobation*; and therefore we ſhou'd not condemn any to the *Torments of Hell*, whom the *Scripture* has not Sentenc'd *thither*.

No mention there of any ſuch thing.

2*ly*. Becauſe this ſuppoſed Reprobation of *Eſau* is without any regard to his doing Evil, without the leaſt reſpect to his Works, *ver.* 11. for the Children being not yet Born, neither having done Good or Evil, that the purpoſe of God, according to Election, might ſtand not of Works, *&c.* And it cannot enter into my mind, That our good God will Damn any Man for his meer Will and Pleaſure, being a thing ſo Repugnant to his Nature, and thoſe Declarations he has made in Holy Scripture, *Ezech.* 33. 11. *As I live (ſaith the Lord) I have no pleaſure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live*; and 2 *Cor.* 5. 10. *We muſt all appear before the judgment ſeat of Chriſt, that every one may receive the things done in the body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.*

None eternally reprobated without doing evil, as is clear from Ezek. 33. 11. and 2 Cor. 5. 10.

3. Be-

3*ly*. Becauſe what we tranſlate *Election* may more fitly be rendred *Preference*, the Original word ſignifying *both*, and amounts to no more than this, That Almighty God Elected *i. e.* *Preferr'd* Jacob *the younger before* Eſau *the elder Brother, in beſtowing upon him the birth right and his Father's bleſſing*; and He *determin'd this concerning both before either was born, and without any conſideration of the goodneſs of the one, or badneſs of the other*; and that Election here ſhould be ſo Interpreted is plain from *Gen.* 25. 23. when the Children were in their Mother's Womb, God declar'd, That the *elder* ſhall *ſerve the younger*: And in this Compariſon, St. *Paul* intimates, That theſe two Brothers were *Types of God*'s Dealing with *Jew and Gentile*; the Jew, who was the Elder Brother, notwithſtanding the Works of the Law was not ſo acceptable to Almighty God, as the Gentile the younger Brother, who notwithſtanding his former Idolatry was preferr'd before him; and this *Temporary Rejection* of the Jew, and *Election of the Gentile was the effect of God's free grace, and not of any merit in either*; ſo that from this place of Scripture it cannot be concluded that *Eſau* was reprobated, for the reaſons before aſſign'd; and alſo

The Election there mention'd, is only a Temporal preference of Jacob before Eſau; and Gods predetermination, that the elder ſhould ſerve the younger. Gen. 25. 23.

4*ly*. Becauſe no Man ſhall be Damn'd for another's ſin, but the Soul that ſinneth, it ſhall die *i. e. Eternally* without Repentance and Reformation, *Ezech.* 18. 20.

P. This ſeems to intimate, That dying Infants will not be Damn'd for Original ſin: Then what need is there of Baptiſm to take it away?

Two things neceſſary for all Infants that are ſaved; Original ſin to be done away; and original righteouſneſs to be created; and both effected in Baptiſm.

M. Yes, there is ſtill need of Baptiſm, becauſe Children cannot be ſaved without *Original righteouſneſs*, and Baptiſm is the only ordinary means of producing that, as I have prov'd before; there being two things to be done for all Children, in order to their Salvation, The *Image of Satan* which is ſtamp'd in *Original Sin to be blotted out*, and the Image of *God which* is ſtamp'd in *Original righteouſneſs to be Created*, and I have ſhewn that thro' God's *merciful Inſtitution Baptiſm do's effect both.*

P. I am ſatisfied that this, and ſome other places of St. *Paul* are miſunderſtood, and do not at all countenance an *Abſolute eternal Election and Reprobation*, (as ſome Men vainly imagin.) But to return whence I cauſed you to digreſs; have you yet Another reaſon for Infant Baptiſm?

The sixth and last reason for the Baptism of Infants; that they can answer the cheif ends of it,

M. Yes, I have, and my sixth and last reason is this; Because Children are capable of answering the cheif ends of Baptism which are these

1*st.* To be dedicated and devoted to God. 2*ly.* To be oblig'd to keep the Covenant. And 3*ly.* To recieve the Grace of God conveyed thereby to inable them to keep it.

1st. In being Dedicated to God.

As for the first, Christian Parents may as well dedicate and devote their Children to God, as Elkanah *and* Hannah *did young* Samuel; *and the Lord without doubt will accept this offering at our hands* 1 *Sam.* 1. 28.

2ly. In being oblig'd to keep the Covenant.

As for the second, Christian Parents may as well oblige their Children to keep the Covenant as the Jews cou'd theirs; and our Baptizing them, lays as great an obligation upon them to this purpose, as their Circumcising them; and St. *Paul* says, *Gal.* 5. 3. every Man that is Circumcis'd, is a Debtor to keep the whole Law; I may on as good grounds testify, That every Man that is Baptiz'd, is a Debtor to perform the whole Gospel; and this *Debt Children* may *contract* as well as Men, tho' they cannot *presently satisfy it.* And

3ly. In receiving the grace of God to inable them to keep it.

As for the third, Children are as capable of receiving the grace of God, which Baptism conveys as grown Persons, having no bar of vitious habits or acts, to obstruct its passage into their hearts, which many times the others have; and we have as good reason to believe, that by *Baptism* Children do recieve the *Seeds of Grace*, as by the *infusion of their rational Souls they receive the Seeds of Reason*, tho' they *cannot till afterwards discover the Fruits of either.*

P. But to this they except and say, *'Tis as fruitless to call upon God to send his holy Spirit upon Infants, as to pray him to illuminate a Stone or a Tree.*

*Their exception to this reason, in * Mr. K. R. R p. 82, 83. and in G. R. p. 170. answered.*

M. I know they say so, and one of them to excuse the matter, wou'd fasten this Comparison upon Dr. *Taylor*, by saying in the Margin of his * Book *that these words were wrote by him*; and yet in the very same page, he affirms the same thing *; and made use of it before without any dislike, which I take to be an approbation of it; Comparisons we say are odious, I am sure there cannot be a more *odius Comparison than this*, which reflects so much dishonour upon our Lord *Jesus*, for his praying for little Children and blessing them; St. *Luke* calls them

To say, 'tis as fruitless to call up-

Infants

Infants *Luk.* 18. 15. And uſes the very ſame word to expreſs them by, that St. *Peter* do's for new born Babes; 1 *Pet.* 2. 2. And can any without Blaſphemy, imagin that Chriſt wou'd ever have Prayed for ſuch Infants; ſuch new born Babes, that they might Receive the Grace of God, if he had known his *Prayer* to be *in Vain*, and to as little purpoſe *as if he had Prayed for the Converſion of Stocks or Stones*? *he prayed Heartily for the one, and Bleſſed them, but never did ſo for the other; and can any then think, (except they are as Blockiſh and Senſeleſs, as Stocks and Stones) that theſe are as Capable of the Spirit of God, as little Children*? 'Tis certain (and I preſume our Adverſaries, will not deny it) that ſince the fall of *Adam* Children have the *Seeds* of *polluting Sin*; and on the ſame ground ſince the coming of Chriſt, and deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt, why may they not have the *Seeds of Sanctifying Grace*? And why may not the one lie hid, and undiſcover'd for ſome time, as well as the other? Infants are *Corrupted* before they can by any *ſinful Act* exert their Corruptions; and why may they not be *Sanctified* before they can by any *Religious Act* make their *Holineſs to appear*? Infants can behold the Light of the Sun, and take Pleaſure in it, tho' they do not underſtand the Nature, and uſefulneſs thereof; and why may they not ſee the light of God's Spirit, ſhining in their dark Hearts and be affected with it, tho' they never heard of it by the Hearing of the Ear? From all which I infer, That there is no Impoſſibility in the Nature of the thing, no inconſiſtency with an Infant Condition, to have Faith in *Jeſus* Chriſt produced in their Hearts, by the Supernatural Operation of the Spirit of God upon them; and on this Account are they qualified as well as grown Believers, for the ordinance of Baptiſm.

on God to ſend his holy Spirit upon Infants, as to pray him to illuminate a Stone or a Tree; a falſe and odious compariſon; Chriſt prayed heartily for Children, and bleſſed them, but never did ſo for Stones or Trees.

Infants may as well be ſanctified with the ſeeds of Grace by the ſecond Adam, as Polluted with the Seeds of Sin by the firſt Adam.

P. But tho' this be a convincing way of Reaſoning, it will not convince theſe men unleſs you prove by Scripture that Infants have Faith.

M. That I have done already in our * firſt Conference, from *Mat.* 18. 6. Who ſo ſhall offend one of theſe little Ones, that *believe in Me*, which I then ſhew'd to be meant of *little Children*, whom Chriſt (who beſt knew their Hearts) affirms to believe in him; and ſo they muſt, or elſe how can they be ſav'd?

Relig conf. pag. 20. 21.

Mr. K. in G. R. pag. 143.

P. But in answer to this, they propose several Questions; * *Why do you say, Children must be Believers or else they cannot be saved? Who told you because Faith in adult Persons is requir'd, as Necessary in them, if they be Sav'd: Cannot God save poor Infants unless they also do Believe?* Has God *told you he will not Save them, except they Believe?*

M. There cannot in my Opinion be more Confidence and Ignorance cramb'd together in fewer lines; he asks, Has God told you he will not Save Infants except they Believe? Why? *Has not God told us as much?* He *that believeth not shall be Damn'd*, Mar. 16. 15. *Without Faith it is impossible to please God*, Heb. 11. 6. *And the Unbelieving shall have their part in the Lake which burneth with Fire and Brimstone, which is the second Death*, Revel. 21. 8. and what then must become of Children if they Believe not, are without Faith, and Unbelieving?

No Salvation for any, but by Faith in Jesus Christ, prov'd from Mark. 16. 15. Heb. 11. 6. and Rev. 21. 8.

P. But these Texts (he says) are to be understood of grown Persons:

These Texts not to be restrain'd to grown Persons.

M. Who told him so? He does say so, 'tis true; but *How does he prove it?* Has he offer'd at any one Argument to make good his Interpretation? Alas! His Authority is not great enough to bear us down with an, [*I have said it*;] he must produce his *strong Reasons* and *Scripture Proofs*, that we are mistaken, in asserting, That Infants cannot be Saved without Faith; or else we shall despise his *great swelling words* as much as he does *Babes Baptism*, as he in Derision calls the Baptism of Infants; and if he cou'd demonstrate these Texts of Scripture to be limitted to grown Persons; why then does he and his Party urge them against Baptizing Infants, whom they no way concern by their own Confession? and therefore to use his own words, *I wonder at this man's Ignorance and daring Boldness:*

P. But how do you prove that any of those Texts (though they may relate chiefly to grown Persons) are so general, as to extend to Infants?

M. Because 'tis plain from them and many other places of Scripture, *That the Gospel owns no Righteousness by which the Children of sinful Men are made acceptable to God, but the Righteousness of Faith; nor any other way of Salvation by Christ, but through Faith*

Children must be believers or unbelievers

Faith in him; I conclude therefore, that unless this presumptuous Author can find out *a middle sort of Persons between Believers and Unbelievers, and discover another way of Salvation for Sinners by Jesus Christ, besides that of Faith in him; he will be forced to acknowledge, that Children must be Believers, or else that they must be Damn'd.*

there being no middle sort between both: if believers, they must be saved, if unbelievers they must be damn'd.

P. But though the Scripture supposes and declares Children to be Believers, yet 'tis difficult to conceive it; and therefore I desire you wou'd a little further explain this matter.

M. I shall; but must first Premise, That *when God has said a thing, how difficult soever it be to apprehend, we ought not to entertain the least doubt of it, much less to dispute against it*; why, then must we distinguish three Things which are to be found in natural and supernatural Productions; and that is, the *Power*, the *Habit*, and the *Act*: For instance, There is a *Power* of Reasoning in *Infants*; there is an *Habit* of reasoning in *grown Persons* when they are a *Sleep*; and there is an *Act* of reasoning when they are *Awake* and imploy'd in discoursing; which Power may well be compared to a Seed, the Habit to a Plant springing from that Seed, and the Act to the Fruit growing on that Plant; and thus it is in supernatural Gifts, and particularly that of Faith: Infants have the *Seed* of Faith, grown Believers have the *Plant* or *Habit* of Faith, and they exert an *Act* or produce the *Fruit* of Faith, when they exercise it on a proper object, and *become fruitful in good Works.*

Faith three Fold, the Power, the Habit, the Act; which answers to the seed, the plant and fruit; Infants may have the power or seed of Faith, tho' they want the other two; the Habit and Act thereof.

P. I am pleas'd and instructed at the same time with your Comparison, but our Opposers have an Exception to make to it; * They say, there can be no such thing as *Seminal Faith* in Infants; because, the first Seed of Faith is Illumination, of which Infants are not capable, because void of Understanding.

Mr. Blackstor. *Ant. pag.* 10.

M. But this is a bold and false Assertion, as I shall prove by two Scripture Examples of *John Baptist* and *David*; the former was filled with the Holy Ghost from his Mother's Womb, *Luk.* 1. 15. and what can that import but his receiving the supernatural Gifts and saving Graces of the Holy Spirit, and particularly that of Faith? with which we have reason to think he was endowed, because *John Baptist* leap'd for joy in his Mother's Womb, when the Mother of our Lord approach'd

John Baptist *had Faith in his Mothers womb, to discern the approach of Christ, and leape for joy upon it.*

David *had hope*

approach'd him, *ver.* 44. And as for the latter, *David* teſtifies of himſelf, That *he had hope when he was a Sucking Child*, Pſal. 22. 9. Thou Lord didſt make me hope when I was upon my Mother's Breaſts; and if theſe two Prophets had Faith and Hope when tender Infants, the one before he was born, and the other ſoon after it, it cannot be Impoſſible for other Infants (who are alike capable in reſpect of their reaſonable Souls) to recieve the ſame Graces of Faith, and hope; neither can their Infancy be an Invincible Bar againſt it; and therefore this Exception and all their little Arguments to maintain it, are meer ſophiſtry and worth nothing.

when he hanged upon his Mothers breaſt other Children as capable of theſe graces. II pag. 8, 9, 10.

P. But he further urgeth; that this word Seminal do's delude men by the Metaphorical acception, to make them think there is a Phyſical growth of Faith, as in ſeeds of vegetative Bodies when they are ſown, when the Growth is Metaphyſical, and only in Reaſonable Souls, that are fit Subjects thereof.

M. But why are not Children fit Subjects of this Grace? *If they are reaſonable Creatures tho' they cannot exerciſe their Reaſon; why may they not be believers too, altho' they cannot exerciſe their Faith?* And who did ever affirm a Phyſical growth of Faith? We only ſay there is ſome reſemblance between the growth of Plants and of Faith; that they both ſpring from a kind of Seed, the one from a ſeed in Nature, and the other from the ſeed of Grace; and that the one grows in a *Spiritual* as the other do's in a *Natural* manner, till they bring forth their reſpective Fruits; and do's not our Lord and St. *Peter* ſay as much, and make uſe of the ſame compariſon? The former reſembles the word to good Seed, *Mat.* 13. 23. and the latter declares we are born, not of Corruptible ſeed, but of Incorruptible, 1 *Pet.* 1. 23. And if this Incorruptible ſeed may be ſown by the Preaching of the Word, ſo may it likewiſe be ſown, and ſo it is ſown by the due Adminiſtration of Baptiſm: What deluſion then or abſurdity is there in this Compariſon of ſeminal Faith? Certainly in this Caſe we may ſay as *Jeremy* do's in another; if we are deceived, Thou O Lord has deceived us; *Jer.* 20. 7.

Children reaſonable creatures, tho' they cannot exerciſe their reaſon, and why not believers too, tho' they cannot exert Faith?

P. Sir, I am fully ſatisfyed in this point; But what ſay you to the next, and that is the cuſtom of our Church to Sprinkle Infants,

Infants, or pour Water on their Faces in Baptism, and not to dip them?

Our Church allows dipping or sprinkling, according to the strength or weakness of the Child.

M. To this I say (as our Church do's) That *If the Godfathers* and *Godmothers shall certify the Minister that the Child may well endure it; he shall dip it in the Water discreetly and warily; but if they certify that the Child is weak; it shall suffice to pour Water upon it.*

P. But they confidently affirm; That our Lord *Jesus* and the Eunuch were dipped; because they went down into the Water and came up out of it, when *John* and *Philip* Baptiz'd them; and therefore all Christians ought to follow such good examples; and to be dipp'd, and not sprinkled when they are Baptiz'd.

St. Bernard *says, Christ was sprinkled by* John Baptist *in* Jordan.

M. I thought I had said enough to this Objection in our first Conference; but because our opposers lay a great stress upon it, I shall give it a further answer; may not a man *go down* into the Water, and *come up* out of it without being cover'd all over with it? If he wet but his Feet, or Ancles, or wade but Knee deep, he go's down into the Water and comes up out of it; and our Lord and the Eunuch, might do no more, and then have their Faces, only wash'd, or sprinkled in their Baptism; and *if you will believe St.* Bernard *this way was Christ Baptiz'd by* John; and as for the Eunuch if you will believe St. *Jerom*, the *Eunuch cou'd not be dipped*; *because the Fountain in which he was Baptiz'd* (which retains the name of the *Æthiopian* Fountain to this day) *is immediately drunk up by the Earth out of which it Springs*; *and then certainly it cou'd not be made deep enough to dip the* Æthiopian *Treasurer in it*; from which Relation and the Authority of two antient Fathers, I think 'tis as probable at least that our Lord and the Eunuch were only sprinkled; as from that Expression; [*they went down into the Water and came up out of it,*] that they were dipp'd, this is certain, that *John* must have *lifted our Saviour*, and *Philip* must have *lifted* the Eunuch *above the Water*; and then have put them wholly under it; if Baptizing must be a *Total immersion* of the Baptized Party by the Baptizer.

* *St.* Hierom *de. loc. Heb. in voc. Bethsar. p.* 500. *St.* Jerom *implies that the Eunuch cou'd not be dipped by* Philip; *the Fountain in which he was Baptiz'd, being forthwith swallow'd up by the Earth.*

P. But to this they say, * That they both went down into the Water, both *Philip*, and the Eunuch and he (*i.e. Philip*) Baptiz'd or dipped him; this is the Rule, not to take the Person up into our Arms.

* *Mr.* K. *R. R. pag.* 202.

M. Sir,

If Baptiſm be a total immerſion of the Baptized by the baptizer; they muſt be lifted up above the water, and then put wholly under it; otherwiſe their dipping is but partial immerſion, as well as our ſprinkling.

M. Sir, this is no *Rule*, but an *Example*, and in this Example it do's not appear that *Philip* did not take the Eunuch up into his Arms; he might, nay he muſt do it, If Baptizing import a *total Immerſion* by the Baptizer; this *you muſt believe, and you are fill'd with incredulity if you believe it not*; otherwiſe for *Philip*, to have waſh'd the Eunuch's Head, or Face with water, had been as good, as to have put only the upper part of his Body under it, the one being but a Partial immerſion as well as the other; and if this be ſo; 'tis more probable that Chriſt, and the Eunuch were ſprinkled than thus totally dipped by *Philip* and *John* Baptiſt; and then they have no ſuch thing as true Baptiſm among them; being only dipp'd in part, and not all over by the Dipper.

Mr. Keach in Go.d refin'd: pag. 63. Pronounces all that are ſprinkled unbaptiz'd People.

P. But they ſay ſo of us; and make even their way of partial Dipping ſo eſſential to Baptiſm, that they pronounce it null and void without it, and have the Confidence to ſay, * *That all thoſe who have been only ſprinkled whether as Children or adult are all unbaptiz'd People, and will be found ſo in the day of the Lord.* What ſay you to this?

M. 1. I ſtand amaz'd at ſuch ſtrang uncharitable Doctirn as this To *Unchurch all the Churches in the World in one Sentence*; *this is worſe than pronouncing an Anathema againſt a General Council*; *it is Anathematizing the whole Chriſtian World*; for if Baptiſm be an inlet and entrance into the Church as * themſelves confeſs as well as we; and no others in the World (but themſelves) have yet receiv'd Baptiſm, they cannot be a Church. And now we have gather'd this Authors opinion of us, and all Proteſtant Churches beſides, which before he ſpake but *mincingly* and *by Halves*; he cou'd not believe *All* the Proteſtant Churches to be *true Churches of Chriſt*; and *Infant Baptiſm did tend to deſtroy too far the Nature of the Sacrament and a Goſpel Church*; he was then loath to Speak out; but here he do's it to the Purpoſe; *you are all of you unbaptiz'd People, and will be found ſo in the Day of the Lord*; *and then certainly we are all of us out of the true Church of Chriſt*; *and are all of us Heathens and Publicans and can be no Chriſtians.*

** Idem pag. 171. by which we may gather his opinion of us, that he thinks us all out of the Church; baptiſm being an inlet or entrance into it.*

Will they dip a dying unbaptiz'd,

2*ly* But what if a converted Heathen, that was never Baptiz'd, lying on his Death Bed thro' a deep Senſe of the Neceſ-

Neceſſity of Baptiſm, ſhou'd earneſtly deſire it of theſe Men? and begin to diſpair of his Salvation without it? wou'd they carry this dying Man to ſome River to dip him? this wou'd haſten his Death, and deſtroy his Body; wou'd they not Baptize him at all? that might Damn his Soul; there is no releif therefore for ſuch a dying, and almoſt Deſpairing Convert, but to Baptize him as we do; which will be no danger to his Body, and may prove ſo Beneficical to his Soul; and if he be duly ſprinkled only, dare any ſay? he *is an unbaptized Perſon*, and *will be Found ſo in the day of the Lord*; this is harſh, and uncharitable indeed.

tiz'd convert, is it not ſafer to ſprinkle him, and if he is ſprinkled in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, dare they ſay he is an unbaptiz'd Perſon.

P. Truly ſo it is, unleſs they have ſome plain Text of Scripture to juſtify ſuch bold Expreſſions.

M. I do not know of any one Text they can bring to this purpoſe; but they are forced to fly to the opinion of ſome *Learned men*, and to *Dictionarys* to make out this, to be the Signification of the word [Baptize] as if Learned men's and the Dictionaries Authority, were equal to the Authority of the Goſpel; and when there are diverſe Significations of the word [Baptize] as *Waſhing*, *Wetting*, *Dying in Colours*, *plunging*, *Sprinkling*, *and Dipping*; our Lord and his Apoſtles muſt reject *all* the other Significations of the Word, and confine Baptiſm to Dipping; let them prove this, that when he commanded his Diſciples to Baptize all Nations, Chriſt meant they ſhou'd alwaies dip them; and let them prove this to be his meaning as Evidently as Water Baptiſm from Scripture, and the controverſy as to this point is over.

P. They produce *Rom.* 6. 3, 4. for their proof of this, Know ye not that ſo many of us as were Baptiz'd into Chriſt *Jeſus*, were Baptiz'd into his death? Therefore we are buryed with him by Baptiſm into death, that like as Chriſt was raiſed from the dead, by the Glory of the Father, even ſo we alſo ſhou'd walk in newneſs of life.

M. But this place do's not prove the neceſſity of Dipping; *Since Chriſt's Death, Buryal, and Reſurrection, may be alſo and is repreſented and ſignifyed, by our Sprinkling or pouring Water on the face of the Baptiz'd Party.*

Rom. 6. 3. 4. do's not prove the neceſſity of dipping; nor is it contrary to our way of Sprinkling.

For our pouring water on the face of the Child represents Christ's shedding his Blood wherein his death is signifyed; the Child's being under the water that is poured on him represents Christs burial; the Childs being lifted up and deliver'd to the Sureties represents Christ's Resurrection.

1*st. By this way he may be Baptiz'd into Christ's Death*; which is nothing else but the shedding of Christ's Blood; his death being so call'd *Matth.* 26. 28. and *Heb.* 9. 22. the shedding of his Blood, for the remission of Sins; without which there is no Remission of them; and the *pouring forth of the Water do's fittly represent This, even the shedding or pouring forth Christ's Blood; for what is the difference between Christ's death and the shedding of his blood? are they not both the same thing? and put for one another in Scripture? and both signifi'd in Baptism as well as the supper of the Lord?*

2ly. *In this way he is buried in Baptism; the Child to be Baptiz'd being put beneath the Font, at least beneath the Ministers hand that pours Water upon him; and so he is cover'd; (as it were) with the watry Element which is above him, and descends upon him.*

3ly. *He rises again; when the Minister after Baptism lifts the Child up, and delivers him back into the Sureties hands; This you know is the practise of our Church in Baptizing Infants; and this holds forth the Death, Burial, and Resurrection of Christ, as well as Dipping; and therefore according to their own way of arguing, may be as lawfully used.*

P. But this they still deny, and boast of having Antiquity on their side; the Antient Church (say they) generally dipped their Christian Proselites, and they living near the Apostles days, best knew the meaning of their Writings; and therefore 'tis probable that by [Baptize] in Scripture is meant dipping.

M. This Argument sounds ill in their mouths, who reject the Authority of the Antient Church in other things; and so they have no reason to urge it in this; the Antient Church was for *Lyturgies, Bishops, Infant Baptism, and Confirmation*; and why do they not herein follow her conduct? If they pretend she has Erred in these other things, why may she not have also Erred in this.

P. But tho' these men can make no advantage of this Argument, yet there being somthing plausible therein, I desire you wou'd give an answer to it.

Their first exception to this answer'd.

M. Sir, it must be acknowledg'd, That the Antient Church were wont to dip their Heathen and Jewish Converts; but then they were generally Men and Women before they were Converted,

The Antient Church

verted, and so cou'd better bear it; they liv'd to in hotter Countries, and there Children were Baptiz'd only in the warmer Seasons of the year; at *Easter*, in memory of our Lord's Resurrection; and at *Whitsunday*, in memory of the Three Thousand Baptiz'd by St. *Peter's* order on that day; and they were Baptiz'd at no other time, but in case of necessity, and for fear of approaching Death; but because the defferring of Children's Baptism so long, was judg'd inconvenient; and Dipping them dangerous; and because their custom was to Baptise Men and Women naked, or only cover'd with a Linnen garment; (which might minister occasion to unchast thoughts;) and because Baptism was a word of Latitude, which signifi'd the Washing or Sprinkling part of the Body with Water, as well as Dipping the whole into it; upon these and the like grounds, the Church in after ages, thought it more safe and modest, and withall Lawful, to change the custom of dipping the Baptized party, into sprinkling or pouring Water on his Face; and these I think are good Reasons for our Church's variation from the primitive practise.

that was generally for dipping was also for Infant Baptism &c. They also Baptiz'd but twice a Year, at Easter and Whitsuntide unless in case of necessity. This being inconvenient, and dipping dangerous and Baptism signifying also washing or sprinkling, dipping was disused.

P. I think so too, but here they make an exception; suppose (say * they) the Jews to whom God had commanded Circumcision, instead of doing that Act, shou'd have devis'd some other thing in the room of it, as the paring off the nails of their Children at Eight days old, and have given that the name of Circumcision, wou'd that have made it Circumcision? and truly they might have had as good a Plea no doubt for such an Invention, considering how dangerous and grievous a thing Circumcision was to little Children, as the inventers of Sprinkling a little Water on the Face of Babes cou'd pretend unto, in changing dipping into sprinkling.

*Their second exception in *Mr. K. in G. ref. pag. 63.64 and in R. R. pag. 190. 191. 197. answer'd.*

M. This is another of your Authors witty Comparisons, which must likewise pass for an Argument; and he has it over and over in several places as if there were something, when in truth there is nothing in it; For

The Jews Paring their Childrens nails instead of Circumcising them is not alike case with our sprinkling instead of dipping them; they

1*st.* I believe the paring Children's Nails at Eight days old (if they pare them to any purpose, as they must, if Religion had been concern'd in it) is every whit as grievous as Circumcision; and therefore there was no reason the Jews shou'd change one painful rite for another.

expresly commanded to circumcise the fore skin of their flesh not the tops of their nails; we no where requir'd to dip and not to sprinkle our Children.

2*ly*. Had this been a much easier thing than the other, the Jews indulging their Children therein, had been a manifest breach of God's Law; For he not only Commanded them to Circumcise their Children at Eight days old; but also plainly told them what *He meant by Circumcision*; They shou'd Circumcise the *Foreskin of their Flesh*; *Gen.* 17. 10, 11. and therefore the Jews *Paring off the Nails* of their Children cou'd not be call'd by that name; it cou'd not be the Circumcising the *Foreskin of their Flesh*; but where has Almighty God as plainly commanded all Christians to be dipped when they are Baptized; let this confident man shew us this, and we have done disputing about this Matter; but till he do's, he only go's about by such *fallacious comparisons* which are no way *Parallel to the case*, to deceive *poor ignorant Souls*.

P. I am satisfied this is a Popular Flourish and no more; but can you make it out fron Scripture, that any of the first Christians might be sprinkled and not dipped?

The Baptism of the Three Thusand by the 12 Apostles in less than one day: A good argument that they were sprinkled and not dipped.

M. I think I can from the three Thousand that were converted, by St. *Peter's* Sermon, and all of them Baptized the same day; *Act*. 2. 14. 41. Now 'tis highly Improbable, if not impossible, that the Twelve Apostles shou'd dip so many in a whole day; much more, When they had but a part thereof wherein to do it; they must each man of them, have dipped two Hundred and Fifty persons apiece; which I believe is more than the Strongest of there dippers is able to perform.

To say as * *Mr.* Norchot *in Baptism plainly discoverd pag.* 43. *do's; the seventy Disciples were there and assisted is more than can be proved no such thing is written in Scripture.*

P. In answer to this * they say besides the Twelve Apostles there were the Seventy Disciples, as *Luk*. 10. 1. That is in all Eighty two, these might well Baptize three Thousand in a day.

M. This is sooner said than Proved; and that Text of St. *Luke* will not do it; it only proves there were Seventy Disciples *in Being* at that time; but do's *not prove* that these Seventy Disciples *were present* at this wonderful Conversion of the Three Thousand, much less that they did help St. *Peter* or the Twelve Apostles in Baptizing them; 'Tis *written* Act. 2. 11. That the Eleven Apostles were there with St. *Peter*; but 'tis *not written* the Seventy Disciples were there with him; and therefore according to this Authors way of

Ar-

Arguing we may conclude they were not preſent; for ſo he Argues againſt Infant Baptiſm, * There muſt be no ſuch thing, becauſe 'tis not written in Scripture, Infants were Bap-tiz'd; and is not the Argument as good againſt the Seventy Diſciples being with St. *Peter* and the Eleven Apoſtles, and helping them in Baptizing the three Thouſand? that it cou'd not be ſo, becauſe no ſuch thing is written.

* *Idem. pag.* 48.

P. I confeſs This is as probable Argument for ſprinkling, as any I have heard from them, for Dipping, but have you another ſuch?

M. I have, 'Tis the Baptiſm of the Jayler; who immediately on his Converſion, and in the ſame hour of the Night it was effected, (which was at mid-night) was Baptiz'd, He and all His ſtraight-way; he wou'd not put off ſo neceſſary a work till the Morning, or for one moment longer; but was Baptiz'd with his Family in the very ſame hour, and 'tis probable in the Priſon houſe; *Act.* 16. 25. 33. And we cannot imagin there was a Pond or River, within his private Walls, to dip the Converted Jayler and his Family in; and therefore may well infer, they were ſprinkled only or had Water pour'd forth upon their Heads or Faces, and were not dipped.

The Jayler and his family being Baptiz'd at midnight; and 'tis likely in the Priſon-houſe; another good argument for Sprinkling.

P. But to this they ſay; * cou'd not the Jayler, and his Family go out of his houſe ſo late? might there not be a Pond or ſome River near?

* *Mr.* K. G. R. *p.* 163.

M. They may ſuppoſe, and believe what they pleaſe, but how do they prove it? The ſame Author affirms that, * Lot *and* Melchiſideck *were without the Seal of the Covenant, becauſe we do not Read that they were Circumciſed*; and he ſays * *Infant Baptiſm is none of Chriſt's Ordinance becauſe the Scripture is ſilent therein, and ſays nothing about it*; now is not this as good an Argument againſt the Jayler, and his Family's going out of the Priſon houſe, and being dipp'd in a Pond, or River by? Becauſe *we Read of no ſuch thing*; *the Scripture is ſilent therein, and ſays nothing about it*; and therefore we may conclude, as they do in the other Caſes, there was no ſuch thing; the Jayler and his Family did not go out of the Priſon houſe to any Pond, or River, to be Baptiz'd; and then 'tis highly probable they were Sprinkled only, and not Dipp'd; the Truth is, theſe Men are meer Sophiſters; when a Negative Ar-

* *Idem. p.* 103.

* *pag.* 90. *To ſay they went out of the Priſon-houſe to a Pond or River to be Dipped, is more than can be prov'd: we find no ſuch thing in Scripture; This negative argument as-*

good as any they bring againſt Infant Baptiſm.

Argument from Scripture is for them, they urge it over and over; but when 'tis againſt them, 'tis of no Force at all; we muſt then be ruled by an implicit Faith, and believe as they will have us; and therefore till they leave off this kind of Arguing, I ſhall infer, That the Jayler and his Family were not Dipp'd in any Pond or River, without or within the Priſon houſe; becauſe we read of no ſuch thing in Scripture; but if notwithſtanding, the Scriptures ſilence, theſe things might be ſo as they wou'd have them; ſo might Infants be Baptiz'd, and *Lot* and *Melchiſideck*, Circumcis'd altho' the Scripture ſays nothing of either.

Acts. 1. 5. a good proof for ſprinkling or pouring water on the Baptized party. Such was the Baptiſm of the Spirit promiſed Joel. 2. 28. I will pour out my ſpirit &c. and fulfilled on the day of Pentecoſt Act. 2. 33. He (i. e. Chriſt) has ſhed forth This i. e. the Holy Ghoſt which is called their Baptiſm and reſembles ours.

P. This I take alſo to be a good Argument for Sprinkling, but have you any more direct proof from Scripture for it?

M. I think I have, and it is this; that the Diſciples were promiſed by our Saviour, to be Baptiz'd with the Holy Ghoſt, *Act.* 1. 5. Which implys that Baptiſm ought to be Adminiſtred after the ſame manner, that the Holy Ghoſt fell upon them; and how that was we may gather from the Prophecy it ſelf of it, and the fulfilling thereof upon the day of Pentecoſt; in the Prophecy 'tis ſaid; I will *Pour out* my Spirit upon all Fleſh *&c. Joel.* 2 28. Which very Expreſſion is repeated in the next verſe; upon the Servants, and Handmaids, in thoſe days will I *Pour out* my Spirit; in the fulfilling thereof 'tis ſaid; it ſat upon each of them *Act.* 2. 3. and *ver.* 33. having Reciev'd of the Father the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt, he (*i. e.* Chriſt) hath *ſhed forth This* which you now ſee and hear.

P. But to this they except, and ſay; that the houſe where the Apoſtles ſate was filled with the Holy Ghoſt, ſo that they might ſeem to have been plunged into it, as in a * large Fiſh pond; and quote two or three Modern Authors for this; adding withal; that the ſprinkling of the Spirit, is not the Baptiſm of the Spirit, for ſo doubtleſs the Apoſtles had the Spirit before they were ſaid to be Baptized with it.

M. In anſwer to which I ſay

1*ſt.* The Scripture do's not ſay; that the *Houſe or Room* where this was done, was filled with the *Holy Ghoſt*; but only with *the ſound, as of a Ruſhing, Mighty wind*; *ver.* 2*d.* but the Scripture ſays the *Apoſtles, were all filled with the Holy Ghoſt*; and that the *Holy Ghoſt, was then ſhed forth upon them*:

* Mr. K. R. R. pag. 205. 206.

ver. 4.

ver. 4. and 33. and therefore this *Pouring forth of the Spirit at this time muſt needs be the Baptiſm of the Spirit*; and conſequently our *pouring forth of Water upon the Baptized party do's well reſemble this Spiritual Apoſtolical Baptiſm.*

2*ly.* We do not read that the Holy Spirit *was poured out or ſprinkled* upon the Apoſtles before; there was little ſign of it in their forſaking Chriſt and denying him; in their doubting and disbelieving his Reſurrection; and asking ſuch a queſtion *Act.* 1. 6. Lord wilt thou at this time reſtore again the Kingdom to *Iſrael*? neither do's that place of St. *John* prove it, *Joh.* 20. 22. receive ye the Holy Ghoſt; ſince our Saviour meant no more by this than, *Be ye ready to receive it*; *and prepare your ſelves for it*; as is clear from *John*, 7. 39. The Holy Ghoſt was not yet given, becauſe *Jeſus* was not yet glorifyed; and that was not till his Aſcenſion into Heaven; as is further manifeſt from *Act.* 2. 32, 33. This *Jeſus* has God raiſed up, whereof we are all Witneſſes; therefore being by the right hand of God exalted and having received of the Father the promiſe of the Holy Ghoſt, he hath *ſhed forth This* (*i. e.* the gift of Tongues) which ye now ſee and hear; not the ſound of the ruſhing mighty Wind which filled the Houſe; the Jews did not ſee nor hear *that*; and therefore *That* was *not the Spirit, which was now ſhed forth upon the Apoſtles, but was only preparatory to it*; and what *was ſhed forth* upon *them was the Holy Ghoſt in all his Graces, and Gifts, of which, the Gift of Tongues was one; and therefore the Apoſtles had not recieved the effuſion or ſprinkling, of the Spirit before this time, which was the day of Pentecoſt*; ſo that notwithſtanding the unſeemly Compariſon of *Plunging in the Holy Ghoſt as in a large Fiſh Pond*, (which will ſooner offend our Ears, than perſwade our minds) the Holy Scripture ſays no ſuch thing; but only declares, That the Apoſtles were all filled with the Holy Ghoſt; That the *Holy Ghoſt deſcended* into them; they did not *deſcend into the Holy Ghoſt*; That the *Holy Ghoſt was poured out upon* them; and *Not they Plunged into the Holy Ghoſt*; that the Holy Ghoſt was *ſhed forth* upon them; and not they *Dipt* into the Holy Ghoſt; and this I think as good Scripture proof, for pouring Water on the Baptized party or ſprinkling him, as any they can bring for dipping.

The Holy Ghoſt not poured out or ſprinkled on the Apoſtles before that time as is evident from Joh 7. 39. *and* Act. 2. 32. 33. *and then it was ſhed forth upon them, and they were not dipt into the Holy Ghoſt.*

P. Sir,

P. Sir, I am alſo Satisfied in this point; and yet there are three more behind, in which I deſire fuller Satisfaction; and that is the Lawfulneſs of Godfathers and Godmothers; Confirmation; and the order of Biſhops; and firſt you know our Church requires Godfathers and Godmothers, to ingage to ſee the Baptized Child vertuouſly brought up, to lead a Godly and a Chriſtian Life; can you produce any Scripture proof for this?

As good Proof from Scripture for the ſureties as the Parents ingagement to ſee the Baptized Child educated in the Chriſtian Religion.

M. As good as any Diſſenter can, for the Parents ingagement at their Baptiſm, to ſee their Children brought up in the fear of God, and the Chriſtian Religion; and that is the Reaſonableneſs of the thing; there being indeed no expreſs Text of Scripture for ſuch Profeſſion, and Promiſes of either; and of this I am ſo Confident, that when they are able to ſhew any ſuch Text, for the Profeſſion and Promiſes of the Parents; I will undertake to produce as good a Text for the Profeſſion and Promiſes, of Godfathers and Godmothers.

P. This ſeems to be a bold Challenge; but I preſume you are pretty ſure in what yon ſay, or elſe you wou'd not make it; but 'tis more Reaſonable (they will ſay) that the Parents ſhou'd become ſureties for their Childrens Education in Chriſtianity then any other Perſons.

M. No doubt but it is; the Law of God and Nature in General, requiring Parents to take care of their Children's Temporal and Spiritual welfare; but yet the ſame Law of God and Nature, requires all Chriſtians (as they have ability and opportunity) to do the like for all their Brethren; *we are each of us our Brothers keeper, and none but a* Cain *will queſtion it*; and had it not been for ſuch *keepers* as *theſe*, many Children when their Chriſtian Parents were martyr'd in the firſt Perſecutions, had been Bred up in Heatheniſm and Idolatry, but by their Godfathers and Godmothers means, they were kept from it; *and therefore there is good Reaſon for theſe now, as there was in the Primitive times, Chriſtians being alwaies Liable to the like Perſecutions, and in no Age exempt from them*; which I believe is a better Reaſon for having Sureties in Baptiſm than any can be brought againſt it.

Sureties needful in time of perſecution and therefore always needful becauſe no age is exempt from it.

P. But

P. But if you cou'd produce any probable Proof from Scripture, it might Silence all Objections againſt it.

Iſai. 8. 2. 3. *a probable proof for ſureties the witneſſes there mentioned 'tis likely being ſuch.*

M. I think I can produce ſuch a proof; it is *Iſa.* 8. 2, 3. and I took unto me *Faithful witneſſes*, &c. Then ſaid the Lord unto me, call his name Maher-ſhalal-haſh baz; which in the opinion of good Expoſitors implies that God approv'd and accepted, of Sureties in the Jewiſh Church, the Congregation or Rulers thereof anſwering for them, at the Circumciſion of their Children; and therefore we cannot think he will Reject Sureties in the Chriſtian Church, at the Baptiſm of our Children, unleſs he had declar'd as much in the new Teſtament, which he has not done; but ſhou'd this not be a probable Proof; 'tis certain from good Antiquity, both under the Law at their Circumciſing, and under the Goſpel at their Baptizing Children, they had Sureties to undertake for them, to ſee them Educated in the one and in the other; This was the Cuſtom of the Jews, and Chriſtians too; in the firſt and Pureſt Ages of the Church; and therefore when they adminiſtered Circumciſion, or Baptiſm to grown Proſelytes, they did it, by way of Queſtions, and Anſwers, in which thoſe grown Proſelytes gave an Account of their Faith, and were forthwith Circumciſed, or Baptiz'd upon it; but when they adminiſtred either Ordinance to Believers Children, their Sureties in thoſe Childrens names anſwered ſuch queſtions, and undertook for their Education in the Jewiſh, or Chriſtian Religion; and to this Cuſtom 'tis probable St. *Peter* alludes 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. The like Figure whereunto Baptiſm doth alſo now ſave us (not the putting away the Filth of the Fleſh, but the anſwer of a good Conſcience, towards God) Baptiſm being in the Apoſtles time, adminiſtred upon the enquiry and anſwer concerning the Faith of thoſe who Reciev'd it, and no other motive to bring any to it, but the ſtrong perſwaſions of a good Conſcience, which prevail'd over the fear of Perſecution, the only viſible Conſequence of it; St. *Peter* thereupon by an Elegant expreſſion, which ſignifies both enquiring, and Anſwering) calls it the enquiry and anſwer of a good Conſcience towards God, or the good Conſcience's Queſtion or Anſwer Unto God; now leſt this ordinance ſhou'd be profan'd by being Adminiſtred to ſuch, as might afterwards Renounce it, or not walk, anſwereable to it, our Church

And ſo is 1. *Pet.* 3. 21. *the anſwer of a good Conſcience, there alludes to the cuſtom of adminiſtring Baptiſm, upon the anſwer of the Baptiſed party himſelf, if of age concerning his faith; or of his ſureties for him if an Infant.*

uſes all Poſſible care to prevent it, by requiring Godfathers and Godmothers, to promiſe in the Baptized Child's name, *To renounce the Devil and all his Works*, &c. *and for his future profeſſion and Practiſe of the Chriſtian Faith.*

P. But this they ſay, is impoſſible to be done; or if poſſible, the Sureties very ſeldom do perform it.

The Sureties promiſes poſſible to be performed by themſelves, becauſe no more than God requires of all that will be Saved.

M. In anſwer to the firſt part of the Objection, I demand; whether it be not poſſible for the Sureties themſelves To renounce the Devil, and all his Works *&c. ſo that they will not follow, nor be led by them*? and to *believe all the Articles of the Chriſtian Faith*? *and to keep God's Holy will and Commandments, and to walk in the ſame, all the Days of their Life*? If they ſhou'd ſay this is not poſſible; they do in effect ſay it is not poſſible for any to be Saved; becauſe all theſe things are required of Chriſtians in order to their Salvation; as is plain from theſe places of Scripture *Epheſ.* 5. 11. Have no Fellowſhip with the unfruitful works of darkneſs, 1 *Joh.* 3. 8. For this purpoſe was the Son of God manifeſted that he might deſtroy the works of the Devil; *Rom.* 10. 9. if thou ſhalt confeſs with thy mouth the Lord *Jeſus*, and ſhalt believe in thine Heart, that God hath raiſed him from the Dead, thou ſhalt be ſav'd; *Mat.* 19. 17. If thou wilt enter into Life, keep the Commandments; and *Luk.* 1. 74, 75. We muſt ſerve him in Holineſs, and Rightouſneſs, all the days of our Life: But if they ſay the Sureties cannot Promiſe the Baptized Child ſhall perform all This, becauſe notwithſtanding all their Care, and Endeavours to inſtruct, and perſwade him, he may not be prevail'd upon to do it; Why? the very *ſame Objections lies againſt the Parents, for making ſuch Promiſes*; becauſe they are not, cannot be ſure their Children will perform them; and yet the Diſſenters do not ſcruple at their Children's Baptiſm, to ingage to bring them up in the Fear of God, *&c.* At leaſt, to uſe their beſt Endeavour to do it; nay * ſome of them will admit of Godfathers and Godmothers in *Caſe the Child to be Baptis'd be a Baſtard, or his Parents Excommunicate*; and theſe are to Profeſs the Chriſtian Faith, in ſuch a Child's name, and to Promiſe for his future Chriſtian Education; and are not *many other Parents Guilty, of as great Sins as Fornication*? are they not as bad as ſome Excommunicate

And 'tis as poſſible for the Sureties as the Parents to make the Baptized Child perform theſe Promiſes.

The Diſſenters allow Sureties in ſome caſes.

* *Mr.* Clerks *Queſt. and caſes of Conſcience.*

Excommunicate Persons, tho' they have not fallen under that Severe censure of the Church? And if they will allow Sureties in one case, why is there not as good Reason to admit them in the other? This is certain, the Generality of Christian Parents, walk very unsuitable to their Holy profession; and the best are Tardy, and offend in many Points; and then by parity of reason they shou'd have Sureties to ingage for their Childrens future Profession, and practise of Christianity, for fear the Parents shou'd be Remiss, in the Performance of it.

pag. 170. He says there are some to be appointed to answer for the Infant i. e. Bastard, and to make a solemn promise to the Church that it shall be carefully brought up and instructed in the faith; the same also is to be done before the Baptizing the Children of Parents that are excommunicate.

P. But perhaps there is some difference between the Profession, and Promises which Dissenting Parents, and Sureties make, and those which our Church requires.

M. No, They are for Substance the very same, as any one will find that has been present at their and our Publick Baptism; and *our Promises* as well as theirs are *Conditional; that nothing shall be wanting on the Sureties part, thro' the Grace of God, to excite them to perform the Baptismal Covenant*; and amounts to no more than this; That *they will do their best endeavour, that their God-Children shall imbrace the Christian Faith and walk according to it*; as is evident from the Exhortation to the Godfathers and Godmothers, which immediately follows publick Baptism; *For as much as this Child has promised by you his Sureties to renounce the Devil, and all his works; to beleive in God, and to serve him; ye must remember that it is your parts and duties to see, that Infant be taught so soon as he shall be able to learn, what a solemn Vow, Promise and Profession he hath here made by you; and that he may know these things the better, ye shall call upon him to hear Sermons; and cheifly ye shall provide that he may learn the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments in the vulgar Tongue; and all other things a Christian ought to know and beleive to his Souls health; and that this Child be brought up to lead a Godly and Christian life*, &c.

The Dissenting Parents and our Sureties promise the same, and both conditional, that they will do their best endeavour that the Baptized Child shall perform the same.

P. But what say you to the Second part of the Objection, that there are few Sureties so conscientious as to perform this?

M. So there are few *Parents*, that make *such promises in their Children's behalf, who faithfully discharge them*; and yet *this is no Objection in Dissenters mouths against their way of Baptism*;

If few of our Sureties so few of their Parents con-

ren

ſcientiouſly perform theſe Baptiſmal promiſes.

and *why then ſhou'd it be againſt ours*? Beſides there are ſome Sureties, who tho' *Cautious* to *Promiſe* on this account, yet are *careful* to make it good by an *anſwerable performance*; but if they ſhou'd not; the *abuſe of a thing is no Argument againſt the uſe of it*; if it were, we muſt neither eat nor drink, becauſe too many do it to exceſs; neither muſt we profeſs the Chriſtian Religion, becauſe (God knows) there are but *few, too few* that *univerſally and ſincerely* practice it; but tho' this be a weak reaſon againſt this practice of our Church, *I heartily wiſh that all the Sons and Daughters thereof wou'd be very diligent and exact in performing this religious Suretyſhip; and it wou'd take off the ſtrongeſt objection that ſome Diſſenters have againſt it, tho' indeed it be none at all, as I have already ſhewn you.*

P. Sir, you have mightily oblig'd me in ſetting this practice of our Church in a clear light; but what ſay you Sir, to Confirmation, which is the next point wherein I deſire to be more fully Inſtructed?

The Rubrick after publick Baptiſm viz. [It is certain by God's word that Children which are Baptiz'd dying before they commit actual ſin are undoubtedly ſaved] was inſerted before Confirmation in Edward the Sixth's days with ſome little alteration; to take off all ſcruple about their ſalvation who dyed with ut it.

M. To comply with your requeſt, I muſt tell you; that heretofore ſome thought this ſo neceſſary to Salvation, that they doubted whether any cou'd be ſaved that died without it? This occaſioned that Rubrick of our Church in *Edward* the Sixth's days to be inſerted before the Office of Confirmation, *viz.* And *that no man ſhall think that any detriment ſhall come to the Children by deferring of their Confirmation, he ſhall know for truth, that it is certain by God's word that Children being Baptiz'd if they depart out of this life in Infancy, have all things neceſſary for their Salvation, and be undoubtedly ſaved*; which very *Rubrick* with ſome little Alteration is now inſerted after the office of publick Baptiſm; not only to give the ſurviving Parents comfortable hopes of their deceaſed Babes, who did not live to commit Actual ſin; but alſo to take off all Scruples about their Salvation, altho' they did not live to be Confirmed; notwithſtanding that omiſſion, their Souls were at reſt in the Kingdom of Heaven.

P. I confeſs I never underſtood the reaſon of this Rubrick ſo well before; but if Children ſhall fare never the worſe for want of Confirmation, then there is no ſuch need of it; and how do you prove this to be a duty incumbent on grown Chriſtians?

M. That

M. That ſome things may be needful to be done by grown Perſons which are not needful to be done by Children, in order to their Salvation, I preſume none will deny; I am ſure it is ſo in many other caſes, as in hearing, praying, and receiving the Lord's Supper; which are neceſſary for ſuch Chriſtians as are *capable Subjects* thereof; but they are not neceſſary for Children who are *uncapable* of performing theſe things to any Religious purpoſe; and ſo are they uncapable of ratifying their Baptiſm by their own voluntary fact, till they have actual Faith and a competent Knowledge; but when they have attain'd to this, they ought to be Confirmed.

Yet confirmation needful for all Chriſtians when they come of age to take their Baptiſmal vow upon themſelves being reckoned among the Fundamentals of Chriſtianity Heb. 6. 2.

P. But how do you make this out?

M. I have already done it in our * Firſt Conference, where my cheif proof was from *Heb.* 6. 2. The laying on of hands there mentioned, and added immediatly after Baptiſm, being (in the opinion of the moſt and beſt expoſitors) meant of *Confirmation*, which was always perform'd by *impoſition of hands* as well as prayer; and therefore takes its denomination from it, and is call'd by the Apoſtle *laying on of hands*; and many of the learned Diſſenters thus underſtood the place, and have written in defence of it; tho' they wou'd not have Confirmation confin'd to the *Biſhop*, but perform'd alſo by the *Paſtor* of every Pariſh.

* *Relig. Confer. pag.* 29.

P. And how do you prove they are miſtaken, and that Confirmation belongs to the Biſhop as a work peculiar to him excluſive of the other?

M. That I alſo have evinced there from *Act.* 8. 14, 15, 16, 17. where the people of *Samaria* who had been Converted and Baptized by *Philip* (who was not only a *Deacon* and *Evangeliſt*, but (as a learned * Antiquary affirms) was alſo a *Presbyter* being one of the *Seventy* Diſciples) were forc'd to wait the comming of St. *Peter* and *John*, two of the *Apoſtles* to be *Confirmed by them*; of which proceeding no other reaſon can be aſſigned, but that *Philip* cou'd not do it.

Dr. Cave *in the life of St.* Philip *pag.* 24. *for which he quotes* Epiphany *Hæres.* 20. *pag.* 27.

P. But perhaps ſome will ſay, That by the laying on of theſe two Apoſtles hands is meant, their *Ordination* of Presbiters to Preach the Goſpel among the *Samaritans*, who being now grown numerous had need thereof.

M. I shall not much contend against this Interpretation; because it rather strengthens than weakens the force of mine; for if neither the *Seventy Disciples*, nor *Philip* who in all likelyhood was *one of them*; cou'd *ordain* Ministers, but the Apostles must be sent on purpose to do this; by parity of Reason, none but the Apostles cou'd *Confirm* that People; because Confirmation was their peculiar work as well as Ordination, as is plain from *Act.* 19. 5, 6. Where after the Baptism of Twelve grown Disciples St. *Paul* immediately *Confirms them*; when they heard this, they were Baptized in the Name of the Lord *Jesus*; and when *Paul* had *laid his Hands upon them*, the Holy Ghost came upon them; and they spake with Tongues, and Prophecyed; and if such as were Baptized when they were *Men and Women* and upon a *Personal* Profession of their Faith, had *need* to be *Confirm'd* by an Apostle afterwards; that they might Recieve the Gifts of the Holy Ghost; *all those* (and such all Christians now generally are) who have been *Baptized in Infancy*, and when they cou'd not profess their Faith, but by the Tongues of others, have *much more need to be afterwards confirmed by the Bishop*; *that they may Profess their Faith, with their own Tongues*; *cancell their Sureties Obligation*; *and take the Baptismal Covenant upon themselves, and withall receive a greater degree of the Spirit of God to keep it.*

Confirmation as well as ordination peculiar to the Apostles; and not perform'd by the seventy Disciples; Act. 8. 14, 15. &c. chap. 19. 5, 6.

P. What you have urg'd in my mind proves that the Apostles were of an higher order than *Philip*, and the Seventy Disciples; and that they Reserv'd such Acts of Church Government to themselves, as Confirmation and Ordination, which the other might not exercise; but how do you prove that our Bishops have Succeeded them in this Superiour office of Governing the Church, which is the last point I wou'd be further satisfied in.

M. We can prove this by a constant Succession of Bishops one after another, which we can carry as high as the Apostles days; as high as St. *James*, *Timothy*, and *Titus*, who were all *Bishops* of the particular places where they resided; *James* of *Jerusalem*, *Timothy* of *Ephesus*, and *Titus* of *Crete*; and for the proof of the first you may consult *Act.* 15. 13, 19. where St. *James* determines the great point of Circumcision, and sitting

St. James Timothy and Titus succeeded the Apostles in this peculiar office being Bishops of the several places where they resided;

sitting as President of the Assembly gives a definitive Sentence about it; wherefore my Sentence is &c. And to this they all agreed *ver.* 22. and when St. *Paul* came to *Jerusalem*, the first Visit he made was to St. *James*, and all the Elders, *i. e.* Presbiters were present; *Act.* 21. 17, 18. Both which Texts shew St. *James*'s great Authority, and Pre-eminence in that City; and that he cou'd be no less than the Bishop of it; for the proof of the Second, you may Consult 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. as I besought thee still to abide at *Ephesus*—— that thou mightest *charge* some that they Teach no other Doctrine——so do. And *Chap.* 5. 22. lay *Hands* suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other Men's Sins; and for the proof of the Third, you may consult *Tit.* 1. 5. For this Cause left I Thee in *Crete*, that thou shou'dst set in order the things that are wanting, and *ordain* Elders in every City, as I had appointed Thee, from which places of Scripture 'tis evident that the Power of Ordination, and Confirmation, (which were both perform'd by Imposition of hands) with other Acts of Church-Government, were committed to *Timothy* and *Titus*; and then by good Consequence they cou'd not be any other then Bishops, of these two places *Crete* and *Ephesus*; To which may be added that they are stiled the Apostles of our Lord in Scripture, tho' they were not of the Number of the Twelve, as *Gal.* 1. 19. But other of the Apostles saw I none but *James* the Lord's Brother; who was another *James* from those reckoned among the Twelve: And 2 *Cor.* 8. 23. Whether any do enquire of *Titus*, he is my partner and fellow-helper concerning you, or our Brethren be enquired of they are the messengers (in the Original it is, they are the *Apostles*) of the Churches, and the glory of Christ: And consequently St. *James* and *Titus* were invested with Apostolical Power and Authority; which is, no other than that is exercised by our Bishops to this day; so that the Apostles power was not *Temporary*, and dyed with them (as some imagine) for then there had been no more than the *Twelve* which our Lord ordain'd; and the *Twelve* had not ordain'd others, as St. *James* our Lord's Brother or Kinsman, *Timothy* and *Titus* to be Copartners with them in the Apostleship and Church Goverment; and that these were above the Seventy Disciples, and of a distinct

St. James of Jerusalem Timothy of Ephesus, and Titus of Crete and are stiled Apostles as well as the Twelve. Therefore the Apostleship not Temporary office. Gal. 1. 19.

ſtinct order from them, is plain from what I have already ſaid, and from the firſt miſſion of both; *Luk.* 6. 13. Our Lord Jeſus call'd unto him his Diſciples; and of them he choſe *Twelve*, whom he alſo named Apoſtles; and of theſe *Twelve*, St. *Peter* is reckoned the *firſt and Chiefeſt of them*; *ver.* 14. and *Mat.* 10. 2. After theſe things the Lord appointed other ſeventy alſo, and ſent them two and two before his Face; *Luk.* 10. 1. And after this, the Twelve Apoſtles *Ordained Seven Deacons*; Men of honeſt Report, full of the Holy Ghoſt and Wiſdom; whoſe Names as well as their Office and Ordination is mention'd, *Act*, 6. 1, 3, 5, 6. So that theſe *Seven Deacons*, theſe *Seventy Diſciples*, and the *Twelve Apoſtles* were of *diſtinct Orders* and *Offices* from each other; the Seven Deacons ſubordinate to the Seventy Diſciples, the Seventy Diſciples inferior to the Twelve Apoſtles, and among the Twelve Apoſtles St. *Peter* was the firſt and cheifeſt, and 'tis likely the preſident of them, tho' otherwiſe of the ſame order with the Eleven; now the *Deacons Preists and Biſhops of our Church* (among which there is an *Arch-Biſhop* to *preſcide* as cheif) do *anſwer* thoſe *ſeveral orders in the new Teſtament*, of the *Seven Deacons, Seventy Diſciples*, and *Twelve Apoſtles* with their *Preſident* St. *Peter*; and come in the room of them; and this Succeſſion we can make out for above ſixteen hundred years; and carry it as high as the Apoſtles days from whom our Biſhops derive their Epiſcopal Authority; and 'tis alſo remarkable that in the Primitive Church *never* any *Presbyter aſſumed* the Power of *Confirmation, never* was the exerciſe thereof permitted to any but the *Biſhop alone*, there being no Authentick Teſtimony that can be produced to diſprove this, as a * Learned man of ours has well obſerv'd. But this being an Argument that has been more fully and largely handled, by ſeveral great and good Men of our Church, I muſt refer you to them, and particularly to Dr. *Scot*'s * Third part of the Chriſtian Life for further ſatisfaction.

*Our Arch Biſhop and Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons, do anſwer the ſeven Decons, ſeventy Diſciples and Twelve Apoſtles, whereof St. Peter, was the Chief in the Primitive Church, the Biſhop alone and never any Presbiter aſſumed the power of Confirmation, as may be ſeen in * L' Strange Alliance of Divine Offices. pag. 268. from * pag. 1633. to pag. 1039. &c.*

P. I ſhall (God willing) get that Book, and Study theſe points a little better, that I may be able to anſwer the Objections and Cavils of all gainſayers.

Our People not ſo diligent to

M. This is a good courſe indeed; and if the Church of *England* Men wou'd take the ſame, as generally and induſtriouſly (as the Diſſenters are won't to do) they wou'd be in a fitter

fitter posture to defend our Church, than the other are to assault it; but the misery is; *our People rest satisfyed that they have Truth on their side; and on that account are Lazy and careless, and will not be at a little pains to search the Scriptures and other good Books to vindicate it against the contradictions of such as blindly oppose it*; for if we do this, we shall find there is no more reason to deny the *Superiority* of a *Bishop* to a *Presbiter*, than there is to deny the *Superiority* of a *Presbiter* to a *Deacon*; and that if there be no difference between a *Presbiter and Bishop*; there is *no distinction between a Presbiter* and *Deacon*; nor *between a Deacon and lay man*; and this Commonly is the event in the Case before us. From *denying this first sacred order* of *Bishops*, *men proceed so far as to question the other two of Presbiters and deacons*; *and come at last to deny all kind of Ordination*; and to allow all People the liberty of Preaching and Governing the Church, if they can but pretend they are gifted and have an inward call (which is the notorious practice of those men with whom we have to do) tho' *such do but usurp the Sacred office as* Corah *and his rebellious Schismatical Company did*; and *take this honour upon them before they are called of God as* Aaron *was*; *Heb.* 5. 4. and *they run as Prophets, before they are sent of the Lord*: *Jer.* 21. 23. upon *the whole I must* tell you; we have *as good proof for this antient rite of Confirmation by the Bishops, as we have for the order of Bishops*; *and as good proof for Bishops, as we have for Infant Baptism*; *and that is Scripture authority and the Universal practice of the Church of God in all Ages, which is the best comment upon it.*

Bishop and Presbiter, as distinct Offices in Scripture, as Presbiter and Deacon; and from denying the first order of Bishops, men come to deny the last order of Deacons, and all kind of Ordination.

Luk. 22. 25, 26.

P. I am also satisfyed in this point; and so are many more who do not come up to full terms of Communion with our Church; they like *Bishops* well enough; but they do not like *Lord-Bishops*, nor their Lording it over God's Heritage, which they think is forbidden by our Lord *Jesus Luk.* 22. 25. 26. And he said unto them (*i. e.* his Disciples) the Kings of the Gentiles exercise Lordship over them; and they that exercise Authority upon them are called Benefactors; but ye shall not be so; whence some wou'd infer that there ought to be no Lord Bishops in the Church of Christ.

No proof against Bishops or their being Lords; the words [greatest and chief] *there suppose some to be less among Christ's Disciples which spoiles the pretense for a parity of Pastors.*

M. 'Tis well you infer no more; and do not conclude from this Text that there ought to be an equality among all Pastors;

for the words immediately following ſufficiently confute ſuch a pretence; but he that is *greateſt* among you let him be as the younger; and he that is *chief* as he that doth ſerve; by which our Lord do's plainly declare, that among his Diſciples ſome one was the *greateſt* and *chief* of them; and this proves that there ought to be a Superiority aud Subordination among the Paſtors of Chriſt's Church; for the words *Greateſt* and *Cheif* ſuppoſe there were ſome *Leſs* and *Inferior* among his Diſciples. which *quite deſtroys* the *pretence of an Equality and Parity* But

This Text only forbids the abuſe of Lordly power in Clergy and Laity, but not the uſe of it.

2*ly*. All kind of Civil Power and the Title of Lord, is not forbidden to Church-men any more than it is to Laymen, by this text of Scripture; for then it wou'd be unlawful for any of Chriſt's Diſciples *i. e.* for any Chriſtians to be Kings, Lords, or Magiſtrates; becauſe *this Text do's not only concern the Clergy, but alſo the Laity; and forbids both to abuſe their Authority and Power by Ambition, Tyrany, and Oppreſſion; and only forbids this*; no Chriſtian whether Magiſtrate or Miniſter ſhou'd exerciſe, ſuch power or Authority over the people as the *King's of the Gentiles did*; *who upheld and maintain'd their pomp and Greatneſs by impoſing cruel taxes and unmerciful exactions on their Subjects*; they ſhou'd not *Lord it or tyranize it* in this manner over *God's heritage*, over their Chriſtian Brethren; ſo that *the abuſe of power is here only condemn'd in Clergy and Laity* and *not the bare uſe of it*.

Melchiſedeck King and Prieſt before the Law. Gen. 14. 18.

Prieſts Judges in capital caſes under the Law. Deut. 17. 9. &c. *Chap.* 19. 16. &c.

Elijah honour'd with the Title of Father and

3*ly*. This is certain; that before the Law, *Melchiſedeck* (who was a Preiſt of the moſt high God) was alſo King of *Salem*; *Gen.* 14. 18. and under the Law, the Preiſts were to be Judges in many Caſes, even of Life and Death, *Deut.* 19. 16. *&c. Chap.* 17. 9. *&c.* and among the Prophets, we read that *Elijah* had the *Title of Lord* given him by good *Obadiah*, who *proſtrated himſelf to the ground when he ſaluted him with it.* 1 *K.* 18. 7. As *Obadiah* was in the way, behold *Elijah* met him; and he knew him, and fell on his face, and ſaid, art thou that my *Lord Elijah*? And this title he again gives him; *ver.* 13. was it not told my *Lord* (*Elijah*) what I did when *Jezabel* ſlew the Prophets of the Lord? How I hid an hundred men of the Lord's prophets by fifties in a Cave, and fed them with Bread and Water? and we do not *find under the Goſpel that the Prieſthood*

do's

do's render a man uncapable of the ſame title of Lord, or of any Authority and juriſdiction, to which he has either a natural or civil right; and therefore as a Clergy man (notwithſtanding his *Spiritual Function*) may Lawfully injoy *Temporal Land*, if he is Heir to it from his Father or any other Perſon; ſo he may Lawfully exerciſe *Temporal power and Authority*, and be ennobled with *Secular Titles* of *Honour*, when *they are given him by his Prince*; *provided he do's not neglect his greater power and Authority, and the higher calling and honour that is beſtow'd upon him by Chriſt the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, for the edification and ſalvation of Souls*; for the Spiritual and Temporal power are not things of ſuch a contrary and incompatable nature but they may very well agree and reſide in the ſame ſubject; as they do in our *reformed Proteſtant Biſhops*, who are alſo by the favour and bounty of our King's *Spiritual Lords*. Sir, I ſhall conclude this long Diſcourſe with this ſhort application; Take heed of *Profaneing* your *Chriſtian Baptiſm by an Unchriſtian and unholy life*; which *is in effect to deſpiſe and renounce it*; *and will render your condition far worſe at the day of judgment than if you had never been Baptiz'd*; wherefore let me beg you to uſe your utmoſt endeavours thro' the grace of God to obey the Covenant you entred into by Baptiſm; to ratify it your ſelf and make it your own Act and deed by Confirmation (if that Apoſtolical ſolemnity of laying on Epiſcopal hands has not already paſs'd upon you) and often to renew the ſame Covenant at the Lord's Table, that you may receive more Spiritual ſtrength to keep it; and if you thus conſcientiouſly obſerve and confirm renew and keep your Baptiſmal promiſes; and perſevere in yeilding ſincere and univerſal obedience to them to the end; you need not doubt of your Salvation having the infallible word of God to aſſure you of it; 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. where that great Apoſtle after he had ſpoken of the Ark, wherein *Noah* and his family were preſerv'd from Temporal Death, adds this; the like figure whereunto even Baptiſm doth alſo now ſave us, *i. e.* from Death eternal; but leſt any ſhou'd reſt in the external waſhing (as the Jews commonly did) he immediately ſubjoyns; not the putting away the *Filth of the Fleſh*; but the *Anſwer of a good Conſcience towards God* by the Reſurrection of *Jeſus Chriſt*.

Lord. 1 K. 18. 7. 2 K. 2. 12. *and under the Goſpel, the Prieſthood no bar to the like honour and power, neither do's it deſtroy any man's civil right; and therefore our Biſhops may lawfully aſſume the Title of Spiritual Lords, and Temporal Juriſdiction; provided they do not neglect their Epiſcopal function.*

The concluſion: To walk worthy of our Chriſtian Baptiſm by a Chriſtian life; and yielding obedience to the Doctrine and Diſcipline of our Church.

P. Sir, I have now done, and heartily thank you for all together; I perceive you ſtill continue firm to the *Orthodox Church of England.*

M. And ever ſhall by God's help, comforting my ſelf (as a * late pious Divine did) with this ſatisfaction; *That I meant well; and have expreſſed my good will, to this poor envyed Church; whoſe truly primitive conſtitution, Pure and Undefiled Religion, I ſhall always admire and reverence; and whatſoever her fate may be; I am chained to her fortunes, by my reaſon and Conſcience; I ſhall ever eſteem it more eligible to be cruſh'd by her fall (which God avert) than to Flouriſh and Triumph on her ruines.*

* Dr. Scots *Chriſtian life,* 1ſt. pt. in the Epiſt. Dedicatory. And by living and dying in her Communion.

P. I reſolve (as you do) to Live and Die in her Communion; *And I pray unto God to give me his Grace, that we may continue in the ſame, unto our lives end.*

M. and *P. Amen. Amen.*

FINIS.

THE CONTENTS.

ANSWERS

To the moſt Material Objections againſt Infant Baptiſm, and Singing Pſalms.

THE firſt Objection from Iſa. 65. 3. *anſwer'd* p. 1

The Jews provok'd God by ſacrificing to Idols, in Gardens on prohibited Altars, and not to the Lord on the publick Altar commanded in Jeruſalem.

The ſecond Objection from the Examples of Nadab *and* Abihu *and* Uzzah *anſwered.*

Theſe Example's miſrepreſented. p. 4

The Fire which Nadab *and* Abihu *offer'd forbidden.*

Uzzah *ſlain for Touching the Ark, or ſome holy thing belonging to it, which was death for any Layman.*

Theſe Examples miſapplyed, Infant Baptiſm being not forbidden as Uzzah *was to touch the Ark.* p. 5

The third objection from Deut. 12. 32. *anſwered.*

The feaſt of purim and enlarging the time of the Paſſover uncommanded things, yet no additions to the word of God. p. 6

A falſe Rule, That nothing ought to be done in Religious matters which has not a particular Command or Example of the holy Scriptures to warrant it.

This falſe Rule leads to Quakeriſm. p. 7

Mr. Lamb *deceiv'd by this Rule turn'd Anabaptiſt, at laſt being undeceiv'd, return'd to our Church, and printed Two Diſcourſes againſt Seperation and Independency.* p. 8

The fourth Objection from Baptiſm and Circumciſion being in full force at the ſame time, anſwered. p. 9

The Jewiſh Paſſover and Lord's Supper as much in force at the ſame time.

And ſo was the Jewiſh Sabboth and Lord's day. p. 10

As good Authority for Infant Baptiſm as for the Canon of the Scripture, keeping the Lord's day, and giving to Women the Lord's Supper. p. 12

Mr. Keach's *ill Character of the Clergy and People of* England.

His horrible uncharitableneſs to all Proteſtants. p. 13

The fifth Objection, what is not commanded is forbidden, anſwered.

No command for the Lord's day, for Women's receiving the Paſſover or the Lord's Supper. p. 14

The Rule, That whatſoever is not forbidden is lawful, to be reſtrain'd to indifferent things.

Many of the Romiſh Ceremonies rejected by our Church, not becauſe ſinful, but becauſe burthenſom, and an infringment of our Chriſtian and national Liberty. p. 15

The Anabaptiſts have anointed their ſick with Oyl which is one of the Popiſh Seven Sacraments. p. 16

To reſemble Infant Baptiſm to the Baptiſm of Bells a bad and unſeemly compariſon.

The

The CONTENTS.

The sixth Objection from Abraham's *fourfold seed answer'd.* p. 17

The proselyte Strangers Abraham's *imputative Seed.*

The Exception to this from Rom. 4. 16. *removed; the promise sure to* Abraham's *imputative Seed on God's part.*

The impious Doctrine of Mr. Keach; *that the Gospel-Covenant is free and absolute without works or any conditions or foreseen Acts of righteousness, or any thing to be done by the Creature.* p. 19

Rom. 4. 5. *rightly interpreted proves the Gospel-Covenant to be conditional and not absolute.* p. 19

The seventh Objection from Mat. 3. 9. *answer'd,*

All that came to John *for Baptism receiv'd it, if they pleas'd; none rejected by him for want of Federal holiness.* p. 21

The eighth Objection from Baptism being needless for Children if already in Covenant, answered.

This Objection as good against Baptizing grown Beleivers, they being also in Covenant before as much as Believers Children. p. 22

Mr. Keach *says, Men may be saved without Baptism.*

Believers Children have a right to the Covenant, before Baptism gives them a right in it. p. 23

Children that die unbaptiz'd in Infancy may be saved tho' their Parents for their willful neglect to Baptize them may be damn'd. p. 24

Men shou'd take heed of dying Unbaptized lest they shou'd be damn'd.

Yet many among the Anabaptists live and die without Baptism.

The Church and Ministers thereof by Preaching Excommunication and Absolution, do as much save and destroy their Members, as Parents do their Children by Baptizing or not Baptizing them.

Mr. Keach *calls it the cursed Decree of the* Milevetan *Council; which Anathamatiz'd those that denyed Infant Baptism.* p. 26

The ninth Objection from our variety of reasons for it, answered.

Christ wrought Spiritual and Corporal cures on Children for the sake of the Parents and Friends Faith, and for the sake of the same why may they not be Baptized? p. 27

These men assign several reasons for Women's receiving the Lord's Supper, yet do not think this variety an Objection against it. p. 28.

The Greek word for [man] is sometimes so restrain'd, as to exclude the Woman. 1 Cor. 7. 1.

The 1 Cor. 12. 13. *as good proof for Infant Baptism as for Women's receiving the Lord's Supper.* p. 30

The consequences from Act. 1. *and* 2d. Chap. *No demonstrations for Womens receiving the Lord's supper.* p. 30

Mr. Keach's *Contradictions.*

Most of the Anabaptists against singing Psalms. p. 32

Scripture examples and Precepts for Singing Psalms.

The first pretence against singing Psalms from the imprecations that are in them, answer'd. p. 33

The Books of Moses *and the Prophets have the like Imprecations, and yet are to be read, and so may the Psalms be sung notwithstanding.*

The second pretence against singing Psalms from James 5. 13. *answered.*

Singing a Christian duty as well as Prayer.

Singing will continue when praying ceases.

Praying a duty on Earth, singing a duty in Heaven. p. 35

The Antiphonal and alternate way of singing antiently practiced in the Greek and Latine Church.

Women forbid to Teach, but not to Sing or use the Responses in the Church, any more than to say Amen *to the Prayers.*

Prophecying in Scripture put for singing Psalms or Hymns as 1 Sam. 10. 5. 1 Cor. 11. 5. p. 36

Alternate singing and reading the Psalms used in Pliny's *time.*

Some instances of the Psalms being ill translated by Sternhold *and* Hopkins. p. 37

Not

Not singing Psalms one mark of Antichrist. p. 38

The tenth Objection from their interpretation of Cor. 7. 14. *answered.*

Sanctification here (says Mr. Tombs) *is such as that of the Creatures to the pure in* 1 Tim. 4. 5. *and therefore more than Matrimonial.* p. 39

The husband and wife St. Paul *treats of no unbelievers, being styled Brother and Sister and one of them said to save the other, which unbelievers cannot do.*

The word [*Holy or Sanctifyed*] *has three different significations, in* 1 Cor. 7. *the Christian Virgin really holy; the unbelieving wife civilly or instrumentally holy; the Children (where but one of the Parents believeth) federally holy.* p. 40

Mr. Keach's *Ignorance or unsincerity in quoting St.* Ambrose *on* 1 Cor. 7. 14. *and* Demosthenes.

The last Objection from the Adult Baptisms of some of the Holy Fathers, answered. p. 42

St. Chrysostom *not born of Christian Parents being sent a Scholar to an heathen Master and bred up an heathen under him.*

St. Augustin *not born of Christian Parents his Father continuing an heathen a long time after, and till very near his death.*

'Tis not certain that Gregory Nazianzen's *Father was a Christian at his birth, having been a long time an Hypsistarian, and converted by his Wife.*

The Adult Baptisms, of a few in former ages; no good consequence, that none were then Baptiz'd in Infancy.

All the Fathers mention'd in the Objection; Strenuous assertors of Infant Baptism. p. 44

Their delay of Baptism, might proceed, 1st *From Libertinism.* 2d. *The example of Christ.* 3d. *Novatianism.* 4th. *The Fear of Persecution.* 5th. *Imitation of the Heathen Converts; And* 6th. *The high esteem of this Ordinance as the most complete Absolution, and therefore receiv'd it (like the Lord's Supper) as their viaticum.* p. 45 & 46.

The Third Part contains some further Scripture proofs and reasons for Infant-Baptism by way of Sprinkling, and for Episcopal Confirmation; together with the Lawfulness of Godfathers and Godmothers, and of the sacred Order of Bishops and their being Spiritual Lords.

MAt. 28. 19. *A good proof for Infant Baptism.*

The exception against this proof answered. Pagans not comprehended under discipled Nations, tho' Children are.

Children discipled by Baptism, that being an usual form of making Disciples. p. 49

Believers Children taught of God.

Rom. 11. 16. *Another good proof for Infant Baptism.*

The first exception against this proof answered.

Every believing parent a Root to his Children as Abraham *was to his.* p. 50

The second exception answered.

The Jews now broken off from this Root through unbelief, and therefore not federally holy now as believers Children.

Mr. Keach *says that the Jews who were broken off did not belong to the Election of grace, and then they must be all damn'd.* p. 51

The olive Tree (i. e. the visible Church) not destroy'd when these branches were broken off.

Believers and their Children grafted in in the room of the Jews and their Children, that were broken off.

The first reason for Infant Baptism, our Lord and his Apostles not forbidding it, when fair occasions were offer'd; as Mat. 28. 19. Act. 15. 5. 10. 28. 29. p. 52.

Their first exception to this reason answer'd. Infant Baptism wou'd have been forbidden, if it is such an horrid sin.

This as good a reason for it, as the not commanding the Jewish Sabbath in the new Testament, is for the observation of the Lord's day; which is Mr. Keach's *reason for it.*

Their

The CONTENTS.

Their second Exception answered.

The paschal cup an uncommanded Jewish custom as much as Baptism. p. 54

Sir Norton Knatchbull *(as quoted by Mr.* Keach*) do's not confute but confirm the custom among the Jews of Infant Baptism.*

Mr. Tombs *says, Baptism was a constant concomitant of Circumcision, if not antienter, and that it was in use for many years together with Circumcision tho' not a Sacrament.* p. 55

The Pharisees did not question John *for Baptizing with Water, but for Baptizing Disciples in his own or Christ's name, if he were not the Messias.*

Their third Exception from Heb. 9. 10. *answered.*

This Text forbids Jewish washings, not Christian Baptism. p. 56

Christian Baptism prov'd to be a regenerating and saving Ordinance from Act. 22. 16. Joh. 3 5. *and* Tit. 3. 5.

As these men expound Heb. 9. 10. *they destroy their own way of Baptism by dipping, which was also practiced among the Jews.* p. 58

The second Reason for Infant Baptism, that the Jews no where complain of their being abridged of Infant-Church-membership and yet complain'd of lesser Matters.

Their first main exception answered.

The case not parallel for our Children to receive the Lord's Supper as for the Jews Children to eat the Passover. p. 59

Neither did they eat it, till they knew the meaning of that service. Exod. 12. 26. 27.

There is as plain proof in Mat. 28. 19. *for Baptizing Christians Children as in* Exod. 12. 3. 4. *for the Jews Children eating the Passover, and as good reason to restrain the latter as the former Text to grown Persons.* p. 60

Their second main Exception answered.

Actual Faith and Repentance requir'd by our Church of grown Persons only before Baptism, and not of Children.

More required to come to the Lord's Supper than to Baptism; faith in the seed sufficient for the one, faith in the fruit needful for the other.

'Tis enough for our Children to have faith and repentance initially; and this was requir'd of the Jews Children, and promised them at their Circumcision even to Circumcise their hearts. Deut. 10. 15. 16. Chap. 30. 6. p. 62

These Men allow profess'd Disciples to be Baptis'd, but none but true Disciples to Communicate.

They also allow a regenerate Child may be Baptis'd, but I suppose will not presume to give him the Lord's Supper.

Act. 2. 39. *and Chapt.* 10. 47. *will warrant the one but the* 1 Cor. 11. 28. *do's condemn the other.*

The third Reason for Infant-Baptism, That the Abolition of it won'd have been a mighty hinderance to the Jews Conversion, by putting their Children into a worse state than they were before. p. 63

The first Exception to this Reason answered.

Circumcision no peculiar Rite to the Seed of Abraham, *nor a Seal to them only of the promis'd Land, being given to the proselyted Strangers of all Nations who had no inheritance in* Canaan.

Circumcision a Seal of Faith not only to Abraham, *but also his Posterity, and to all other people that imbraced the Jewish Religion.* p. 64.

Their second Exception answered.

Infants Church-membership once inacted by an old Law, therefore still in force, being not repealed by a new.

Infants Church membership a Legacy in Christs will (the old Testament) and not disanull'd in the codicil annex'd to it (which is the New Testament) Therefore what God hath given and bequeathed, let not man take away. p. 66

The fourth Reason for Infant Baptism; that God must have fail'd in his promise to his Church, and had no Church in the world, for above Sixteen hundred Years; if this be an unchurching error as these men hold.

Their first exception, that Infant Baptism was not practised in the Church till above Three Hundred Years after Christ; answered by Mr. Walker *in his modest plea for Infant Baptism. pag.* 278. 281. &c. *Their*

The CONTENTS.

Their second Exception answered; Infant Communion no fundamental error. p. 67

The Church may err superstructively, but not fundamentally.

Their third Exception, That there might be an invisible Church amidst Antichristian corruptions answered.

The holding Christ's Church Invisible the parent of dangerous errors.

According to our Opponents it consists of visible Saints therefore cannot be wholly invisible.

The Church of God visible in all ages, therefore call'd the Light of the world, a City on a Hill. p. 68

The fifth Reason for Infant Baptism; That 'tis the only ordinary means of our Childrens salvation.

Their Exception to this answered.

'Tis dangerous to neglect the ordinary and trust to the Extraordinary mercy of God; as those Parents do, who let their Children die without Baptism. p. 69

An exception to page 14th of the first Religious Conference &c. answered.

The excepted passage not contrary to Rom. 4. 7. 8. *because besides the pardon of Original sin, Infants must be sanctified before they can be saved.* Rom. 4. 6. *and* Rev. 19. 6 p. 70

We may be as certain of Childrens as of grown persons having faith, and can only know either by the judgment of charity.

They have as much reason to rebaptize hypocrites as adult Proselytes for their supposed want of Faith in their former Baptism.

Mr. Blackwood *(a profest Anabaptist) says Original Sin do's not simply damn.*

Another exception to the 25th. *page of Religious Conference answered.*

Esau's *eternal Reprobation cannot be proved from* Rom. 9. 11. *no mention there of any such thing.* p. 72

None eternally reprobated without doing evil evident from Ezeck. 33. 11. *and* 2 Cor. 5. 10.

The Election mention'd Rom. 9. 11. *only a temporal preferance of* Jacob *before* Esau, *and God's predetermination that the Elder shou'd serve the Younger.* Gen. 25. 23.

Two things necessary for the salvation of Infants, original sin to be done away, and original righteousness to be created, and both effected in Baptism. p. 73

The sixth and last Reason for the Baptism of Infants.

That they can answer the cheif ends thereof; 1st. *In being dedicated to God.* 2d. *Oblig'd to keep the Covenant.* 3d. *Receiving thee Grace of God to inable them to keep it.*

Their Exception to this Reason answered; To say, 'tis as fruitless to call upon God to send his holy Spirit upon Infants as to pray him to illuminate a Stone or a Tree, a false and odious Comparison; Christ praying heartily for Children and blessing them, but never doing so for Stones or Trees. p. 74.

Infants may be sanctified with the seeds of Grace as well by the second Adam, *as polluted with the seeds of sin by the first* Adam.

No salvation for any Soul but by Faith in Jesus Christ *proved from* Mar. 16. 15. Heb. 11. 6. *and* Rev. 21. 8.

These Texts not to be restrain'd to grown persons. p. 76

Children must be believers, or unbelievers, no middle sort between both. If believers they must be saved, if unbelievers, damn'd.

Faith threefold, the power, the habit, the act, which answers to the seed, the plant and fruit; Infants may have the power or seed of Faith tho' they want the habit and act there of. p. 77.

John Baptist *had faith in his Mothers Womb to discern the approach of Christ, and leapt for joy upon it;* David *had hope when he hanged upon his Mothers breast.*

Other Children *as capable of these and the like graces.*

Children reasonable creatures tho' they cannot exercise their reason; and why not believers also, tho' they cannot exert faith. p. 78

Our Church allows dipping or sprinkling according to the strength and weakness of the Child.

St. Bernard *says Christ was sprinkled by* John Baptist *in* Jordan.

St. Jerom *implies that the Eunuch cou'd not be dipped by* Philip, *the Fountain in which he was Baptiz'd being forthwith swallow'd up by the Earth.* p. 79

If Baptism be a total immersion of the baptized by the baptizer, they must be lifted up above the Water, and then put wholly under it; otherwise their Dipping is but partial immersion as well as our Sprinkling.

Mr. Keach *pronounces all that are Sprinkled, whether as Children or adult, unbaptiz'd People.*

By which we may gather his Opinion of us, that he thinks us all out of the Church, Baptism being an inlet or entrance into it.

Will they dip a dying Unbaptiz'd Convert? is it not safer to Sprinkle him? and if he is sprinkled by one duly qualifyed, in the Name of the Father Son and Holy Ghost, dare they say he is an Unbaptized person? p. 80. 81

Rom. 6. 3, 4. *Do's not prove the necessity of Dipping, nor is it contrary to our way of Sprinkling: for our pouring Water on the face of the Child represents Christ's shedding his Blood wherein his Death is signifyed; the Child being under the Water that is poured on him represents Christ's buryal; the Child's being lifted and re-delivered to the sureties represents Christ's resurrection.* p. 81 *and* 82

Their first exception to this answered.

The antient Church that was Generally for Dipping was also for Infant Baptism &c.

They also Baptiz'd but Twice a year, at Easter and Whitsuntide, unless in case of necessity.

This being inconvenient, and dipping sometimes dangerous, and Baptism signifying also washing or sprinkling, Dipping was disused.

Their second exception answered.

The Jews pareing their Childrens nails instead of Circumcising them not a like case with our sprinkling instead of dipping them.

They expresly commanded to circumcise the foreskin of their Flesh not the tops of their nails; we no where in Scripture Commanded to dip and not to sprinkle our Children. p. 84

The Baptism of the three thousand in less than one day a good Argument that they were sprinkled and not dipped.

That the 70 Disciples were there and assisted more than can be proved, no such thing written.

The Jayler and his Family Baptized at midnight and 'tis likely in the Prison house another good Argument they were Sprinkled. p. 85

To say they went out of the Prison house to a Pond or River to be dipped is more than can be proved, we find no such thing in Scripture.

This Negative Argument as good as any they bring against Infant-Baptism.

Act. 1. 5. *a good proof for sprinkling or pouring water on the Baptized party; such the Baptism of the spirit promised.* Joel. 2. 28. *I will pour out my Spirit,* &c. *and fulfilled on the day of Pentecost* Act. 2. 33. *He (*i. e. *Christ has shed forth this (*i. e. *the Holy Ghost) which is call'd the Apostles Baptism and resembles ours.* p. 86.

The Holy Ghost not poured out or sprinkled on the Apostles before that time; evident from Joh. 7. 39. Act. 2. 32. 33. *and then it was shed forth upon them, and they were not dipt or plunged into the holy Ghost.* p. 87

As good proof from Scripture for the sureties as the Parents ingagement to see the Baptized Child educated in the Christian Religion.

Sureties needful in time of Persecution, and therefore always, no age being exempt from it.

Isa. 8. 2. 3. *a probable proof for Sureties, the Witnesses there mentioned being in likelyhood such.* p. 89

And so is 1 Pet. 3. 21 *the answer of a good Conscience there alludes to the custom of administring Baptism upon the answer of the Baptized party himself (if of age) concerning his faith; or of his Sureties for him (if an Infant.)*

The sureties promises possible to be performed by themselves, being no more than God requires of all that will be saved. p. 90

And 'tis as possible for the sureties as the Parents to make the Baptized Child perform these promises.

The Dissenters allow sureties in some cases, viz. *when the Child is a bastard or his parents excommunicate.*

The

The CONTENTS.

The Diſſenting Parents and our ſureties promiſes the ſame, and both conditional; that they will do their beſt endeavour that the Baptiz'd Child ſhall perform the ſame. p. 91

If few of our ſureties ſo few of their Parents conſcientiouſly perform theſe Baptiſmal promiſes.

The Rubrick after puplick Baptiſm viz. [*it is certain by God's word, that Children which are Baptiz'd dying before they commit actual ſin are undoubtedly ſaved*] *was inſerted before the office of Confirmation in* Edward *the* VI. *days with ſome little alteration, to take off all ſcruple about their ſalvation who dyed in infancy without it.* p. 92

Yet Confirmation needful for all Chriſtians when they come of age to take their Baptiſmal Vow upon themſelves, being reckon'd among the fundamentals of Chriſtianity; Heb. 6. 2. p. 93

Confirmation as well as Ordination peculiar to the Apoſtles and not perform'd by the ſeventy Diſciples of which number Philip *was one;* Act. 8. 14, 15. Chap. 19. 5. 6.

St. James Timothy *and* Titus *ſucceeded the Apoſtles in this peculiar office being Biſhops of the ſeveral places where they reſided;* St. James *of* Jeruſalem; Timothy *of* Epheſus *and* Titus *of* Crete; *and ſtiled Apoſtles as well as the Twelve, therefore the Apoſtleſhip no temporary office.* Gal. 1. 19. p. 94 *and* 95

Our Archbiſhop and Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons do anſwer the ſeven Deacons, ſeventy Diſciples and Twelve Apoſtles whereof St. Peter *was the chief.* p 96

In the primitive Church *the* Biſhop *alone, and never any Presbiter aſſumed the Power of Confirmation.*

Our People not ſo diligent to defend our Church *as others to oppoſe it.*

Biſhop *and Presbiter as diſtinct Offices in Scripture as Presbiter and Deacon; and from denying the firſt Order of* Biſhops *men come to deny the laſt Order of Deacons, and all kind of Ordination.* p. 97

Luk. 22. 25, 26. *no good proof againſt* Biſhops *or their being Lords; the words* [*greateſt and chief*] *there ſuppoſing ſome to be leſs among Chriſt's Diſciples, which ſpoils the pretence of proving hence a parity of Paſtors.*

This text only forbids the abuſe of Lordly power in Clergy *and* Laity, *but not the uſe of it.*

Melchiſidec *King and Prieſt before the Law;* Gen. 14. 18. p. 98

Prieſts Judges in Capital Caſes under the Law. Deut. 17. 9. Chap. 19. 16.

Elijah *honour'd with the title of Father and Lord* 1 K. 18. 7. 2 K. 2. 12.

And under the Goſpel the Prieſthood no bar to the like honour and power, neither do's it deſtroy any man's civil right.

And therefore our Biſhops *may Lawfully aſſume the Title of Spiritual Lords, and exerciſe temporal juriſdiction; provided they do not neglect their Epiſcopal function.*

The Concluſion; To walk worthy of our Chriſtian Baptiſm *by a* Chriſtian *life, and yielding Obedience to the Doctrine and diſcipline of our Orthodox* Church *of* England; *by living and dying in her* Holy Communion.

ERRATA.

FOR *cannot qualifie the Jews Children for Baptiſm,* read *cannot qualifie our Children for Baptiſm, becauſe it did not qualifie the Jews Children for Baptiſm,* p. 20. l. 15. *Jarius* for *Jairus,* p. 27. l. 11. *Trimphant* for *Triumphant,* l. 38. *Communcating* for *Communicating,* p. 29 l. 12. *are,* too much, p. 33. l. 16. *women* for *woman,* p. 36. l. 19. *pecular* for *peculiar,* l. 29. *Pſamls* for *Pſalms,* p. 38. l. 11 read *he (i. e. Chryſoſtom)* p. 42. l. 24. in the Margin of p. 44 *Aug. de Bap. contra Donat.* l. 4. 2. 24. for l. 4. c. 24. *Apoſtles* for *Apoſtle,* p. 51. l. 29. *Circumſion* for *Circumciſion,* p. 56. l. 26. in the Margin bottom of p. 91. for *Pats con- ren ſcientiouſly,* r. *Parents conſcientiouſly.*